

Charles F. Wissenbach, Bolton.
James D. Sullivan, Danvers.
John H. Gilboy, East Brookfield.
Patrick F. Shea, Fitchburg.
Harold J. McCormick, Gardner.
Robert P. Sheehan, Harvard.
James J. Dowd, Holyoke.
Edward Thomas Murphy, Hyannis.
Mary E. O'Toole, Leominster.
William F. Goodwin, Plymouth.
Timothy W. Fitzgerald, Salem.
William E. Brennan, Whitman.

MICHIGAN

Ozro K. Hess, Akron.
Bernie C. McLeish, Bay Port.
Cornelius Oosta, Caledonia.
Kay Rice, Camden.
John A. Yagley, Dearborn.
George B. McIntyre, Fairgrove.
Stuart J. Haddrill, Lake Orion.
Frank E. Moore, Lakeview.
Emmett E. Scofield, Leslie.
Clare E. Bishop, Millington.
James F. Jackson, Mohawk.
James J. Harrington, Painesdale.
Glenn Davis, Rockford.
Victoria S. Nye, Rose City.
Hazel A. Graham, Whittemore.

MISSOURI

Adam B. Jenkins, Advance.
William A. Barton, Alton.
Felix P. Wulff, Argyle.
Ezra W. Mott, Armstrong.
Jesse D. Burwell, Browning.
Arthur J. Clayton, Brunswick.
George W. Shelton, Dixon.
Roy M. Burchett, Elsberry.
Claud W. Boone, Gainesville.
Mary E. Woody, Golden City.
Orville L. Davis, Keytesville.
Champ C. Ray, Middletown.
Edward H. Mertens, Morrison.
Clyde E. Walker, Mountain View.
Lloyd M. Weaver, New London.
Mary G. Kenton, Norborne.
Helen T. Meagher, Oregon.
Fred A. Lambert, Princeton.
Dayton A. Street, Purdin.
Charles E. Logan, Spickard.
Thomas W. Withrow, Troy.
Carl A. Baldwin, Vienna.
Fay B. Swicegood, Weaubleau.
Blanche E. Tucker, Westboro.
Mabel Smulling, Wyaconda.

MONTANA

Forrest L. De Rosia, Libby.
James J. Price, Three Forks.

NEW JERSEY

Cameron M. McCurdy, Fair Lawn.
Albert P. Troy, Palisade.

NEW MEXICO

Filiberto E. Lucero, Espanola.
Robert S. Sanchez, Estancia.
Alta V. Short, Monument.
Thomas N. Lawson, Tucumcari.
Vera Clayton, Tularosa.

NEW YORK

Verner Sharp, Altamont.
Eber T. McDonald, Cayuga.
Guy C. Hazelton, Coeymans.
Harry D. Hickey, Lewiston.
James T. Crotty, Monroe.
Charles S. Donnelley, Utica.
Stewart A. Farrar, Warrensburg.
Herbert D. Carlton, West Chazy.

OKLAHOMA

Leonard C. Peterman, Davis.
Weltha Guilford Heflin, Erick.
Charles H. Hatfield, Hydro.
Joseph R. Reed, Lawton.

OREGON

William W. Lower, Creswell.
Ruth E. Hoffman, Jacksonville.
Burt E. Hawkins, Klamath Falls.
Lewis Lee Mead, Nehalem.
Volney E. Lee, North Powder.
Richard J. Collins, Oceanlake.
John C. Bilyeu, Tigard.
Emmett Lee Chenault, Union.
Harold R. White, Wasco.

UTAH

Jabez W. Dangerfield, Provo.

VIRGINIA

Edwin L. Toone, Boydton.
Grady W. Garrett, Cumberland.
Herbert H. Rhea, Damascus.
H. Thornton Davies, Jr., Manassas.
Forrest L. Harmon, Melfa.
Garnett A. Kellam, Onley.
Virginia S. Lucas, Pembroke.

WASHINGTON

Emma H. Davis, College Place.
Thomas H. Mansfield, Forks.
Marcus O. Nelsen, Kent.
Ronald L. Chard, Pomeroy.
Jessie A. Knight, Shelton.

WEST VIRGINIA

Olga O. Baughman, Belington.
Robert Lake Bailey, Bluefield.
George J. Carter, Jr., Fort Gay.
Glenn A. Fowler, Harrisville.

WYOMING

George H. Case, Lander.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, AUGUST 1, 1939

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art found by those who truly seek Thee, known by those who love, and seen by all whose hearts are pure, we desire to begin, to continue, and to end this day with Thee.

We pray that all the barriers that separate us from Thee and our fellowmen may be submerged by a renewed love and consecration, and that every thought of our mind may be brought into obedience to the spirit of the Christ.

Wilt Thou lift upon us the light of Thy countenance so that it may be a day of unclouded vision. May we give ourselves unreservedly to the Great Companion of our souls who is too wise to err and too kind to injure.

In His name we pray, whose will is our peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SUNDRY MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2864. An act to provide for the financing of a program of recoverable expenditures, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 281) entitled "An act to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930."

INVESTIGATION BY COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution from the Committee on Accounts and for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 278

Resolved, That the expenses of conducting the investigation authorized by House Resolution 277, incurred by the Committee on Ways and Means, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$5,000, including the expenditures for the employment of experts, clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or by any subcommittee thereof, conducting such investigation or any part thereof, signed by the chairman of the committee and approved by the Committee on Accounts.

Sec. 2. That the official committee reporters shall be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

INVESTIGATION OF NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following privileged resolution which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 265

Resolved, That the expenses of conducting the investigation authorized by House Resolution 258, incurred by the special committee appointed to investigate the National Labor Relations Board, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$ including expenditures for the employment of experts and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman thereof and approved by the Committee on Accounts; and the head of each executive department is hereby requested to detail to said special committee such number of legal and expert assistants and investigators as said committee may from time to time deem necessary.

Sec. 2. That the official committee reporters may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia if not otherwise officially engaged.

With the following amendment:

Line 5, after the dollar mark, insert "50,000."

The amendment was agreed to, and the resolution as amended was agreed to.

INVESTIGATION OF ALASKAN FISHERIES

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following privileged resolution, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 163

Resolved, That the expenses of conducting the study and investigation authorized by House Resolution 162, incurred by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to make an investigation of the fisheries of Alaska, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$25,000, including expenditures for the employment of experts and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman thereof and approved by the Committee on Accounts; and the head of each executive department is hereby requested to detail to said committee such number of legal and expert assistants and investigators as said committee may from time to time deem necessary.

Sec. 2. That the official committee reporters shall be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia.

With the following committee amendment:

Line 5, strike out "\$25,000" and insert "\$15,000."

The amendment was agreed to, and the resolution as amended was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and to include therein an address I delivered at the exercises held

at the John Ericson statue in Potomac Park, Washington, D. C., July 31, 1939.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PIERCE of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. PIERCE of Oregon addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

NEW SOURCES OF TAXES

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, it will be distressing news to the American people to learn that yesterday a new "sweeping investigation" into the Federal revenue structure was arranged by a special House Ways and Means subcommittee. For what reason and for what purpose, listen to this:

To search for new sources to tax to help raise money to pay growing costs of government.

I say that it will be sad and distressing news to the thrifty, hard-working American people to learn that and know at the same time that their Congress has done nothing of late years to reduce the cost of government; and we are asked to consider today another bill, the lending and spending bill of the President, which will plunge this Nation deeper into debt in the sum of \$2,000,000,000. The committee will have to find ways, if this bill passes, to further tax and burden the people to pay that back, together with the colossal sum of more than \$40,000,000,000 now burdening the American people.

The power to lend this money is inseparable from the power to buy political support. This means more centralization of power in Washington. The purse strings in the hands of a paternal government is the lash to whip the people into submission and obedience.

We are asked to do this in the face of the fact that we are now borrowing 39 cents out of every dollar expended by the Federal Government and taking 23 cents out of every dollar received by the wage earner of the country in taxes.

Lord Bryce, with a degree of pride in his work, when he wrote *The American Commonwealth*, pointed out that in 1880 only 1 person out of 652 received public aid. Today one person out of every six is feeding at the public trough, under a policy of government that believes in wasting what a thrifty nation amassed by free enterprise. Public credit will collapse some day, and that day may be near at hand, and the present trend is bringing it nearer with accelerating speed.

We have doubled our public debt since 1932. National expenditures have reached dizzy heights, Federal deficits are progressively increasing, and the lending-spending bill would hasten and increase it. The use of the people's money means the purchasing of the electorate, and that means the end of our Republic.

The time has come to stop wasting the people's money.

UNITED STATES HOUSING BILL

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I am leaving tonight with a group of other delegates to attend the Inter-parliamentary Union. Before going, I want to express the hope that the House will defeat the Senate-approved United States Housing Authority bill which will drain the United States Treasury of some \$2,700,000,000 over the next 60 years in the way of outright grants for rent subsidies on slum-clearance projects in the metropolitan areas. If this bill and the spend-lend measure are defeated, it will raise the prestige of the House and help to restore confidence in the future financial stability of this Government and will encourage private industry to employ its idle cash and our idle men.

The Federal Government cannot continue indefinitely to spend \$10,000,000 a day more than its revenues without

eventually facing bankruptcy. Let us strive for more business in government and less government in business. We cannot afford to sacrifice future security for immediate benefits.

I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MANUFACTURE OF FERTILIZER PHOSPHATES BY T. V. A.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to follow the gentleman who just addressed the House [Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska], for I would like to call attention to an appropriation that the New Deal jammed through Congress of \$450,000 for a T. V. A. plant, manufacturing fertilizer phosphates, in spite of the fact that there are 191 private companies in the United States capable of producing 8,840,000 tons of those phosphates, which is more than twice the amount consumed in our Nation in any one year. On the one hand, we kill the goose that laid the golden egg, and on the other hand we spend time here discussing a spending-lending program, allegedly to revive business. This sort of procedure passeth all understanding. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include therein a letter I have written to the chairman of the Temporary Economic Committee.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. THORKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include excerpts from Senate Document No. 14, and excerpts from publications substantiating my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include therein a statement made by the Medical Society of the State of New Jersey.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS AUTHORITY

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, just a little over a year ago the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, of which I am a member, reported, and the Congress passed, the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938. That act created the Civil Aeronautics Authority and transferred to it the personnel and property of the Bureau of Air Commerce of the Department of Commerce and the Bureau of Air Mail of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Under the act the Authority is charged, among other things, with the regulation, promotion, development, and inspection of air transport and its attendant facilities and the operation of many navigation aids. In my opinion, the Authority has done a good job during the first year of its existence.

Recently it was charged on the floor that the Authority has 3,600 employees to regulate 4,724 office workers of the American air lines. Similar statements have been made on other occasions. In order to keep the record straight, may I suggest that I have before me the official figures supplied by Col. Edgar S. Gorrell, president of the Air Transport Association. Colonel Gorrell states that the Civil Aeronautics Authority has 560 employees engaged in regulating not only all of the domestic and international air lines, but also all

the aviation schools, all aircraft manufacturers, and all of the aviation mechanics and pilots in the United States. Colonel Gorrell states:

To suggest that with this relative handful the Authority is overstaffed is unthinkable.

Colonel Gorrell points out that the remainder of the employees of the Civil Aeronautics Authority are not engaged in regulatory work at all but, like the employees in the Lighthouse Service, are engaged in the purely executive and non-regulatory work of operating the air beacons, air traffic-control towers, and other navigation facilities which serve not only the air lines but also all private flyers and the Air Corps of the United States Army and the naval air service.

Colonel Gorrell further points out that the Civil Aeronautics Authority has actually 560 employees engaged in regulatory work, as compared with the 2,599 regulatory employees of the Interstate Commerce Commission. It has 2,662 employees operating the beacon lights, the traffic-control towers, and the radio range stations of the airways, as against the 5,017 employees of the Bureau of Lighthouses, which performs a similar operating function. [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HAWKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include an article which appeared in the Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE LATE HON. JOSEPH TAGGART

Mr. GUYER of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GUYER of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, two former Members of Congress from the Second District of Kansas passed away since the adjournment of the Seventy-fifth Congress. The first was Hon. Charles F. Scott, and soon after Hon. Joseph Taggart. After threescore years and ten of eventful life, Joseph Taggart passed to the Great Beyond.

Joseph Taggart was a colorful figure in official life for a number of years as county attorney and as Congressman from the Second District of Kansas. Besides being a public official, Mr. Taggart was a teacher for many years in the public schools of Wyandotte County, where he made an enviable record of public service.

Mr. Taggart had a very alert and brilliant mind, and, true to his Celtic ancestry, his tongue was touched with the fire of eloquence and sparkling wit. Many of his witticisms will long survive in the memory of his associates whom he was wont to entertain in idle moments between the more serious matters of life.

As county attorney of Wyandotte County for several terms, he attained a place in the roster of prosecutors that was seldom surpassed and not often equaled. In the 5 or 6 years he was prosecutor of Wyandotte County he achieved a wide reputation as a relentless prosecutor. Some of the cases he prosecuted became nationally known—notably a case of poisoning which was widely discussed and in which Mr. Taggart secured a conviction.

Mr. Taggart was a profound student of history and philosophy as well as of letters, which rendered him a most interesting and entertaining conversationalist. He was first elected to Congress on November 7, 1911, to fill out the unexpired term of Hon. A. C. Mitchell, who was elected in November 1910, but who died about 4 months after he took the oath of office, on March 4, 1911. Mr. Taggart was reelected in 1912 and in 1914, being succeeded in 1916 by Hon. E. C. Little.

Mr. Taggart was a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, where, by his knowledge of the law, he attained a high place in the regard of the members of that great committee. The chairman, Mr. SUMNERS of Texas, is the only man now left on that committee who served with Mr. Taggart, and who remembers his valuable service there. While his service was comparatively brief in the House, he made

himself felt and highly respected for his intellectual attainments, native wit, and ready repartee.

Mr. Taggart was a devoted Democrat and believed in the political philosophy of Thomas Jefferson, but never subscribed to the New Deal, and in recent years broke with the more radical leadership of his party.

Mr. Taggart had the faculty of making friends, who have been saddened by his death. They will always remember him for his brilliant mind, scintillating wit, and generous impulses. He served with the rank of captain in the Quartermaster Corps in the World War and since then occupied places of trust and honor in the Veterans' Bureau, Department of the Interior, and as judge of the Court of Industrial Relations in Kansas. In all these positions Mr. Taggart served with distinction and credit to himself. He leaves to his widow and children an honored name and the memory of a useful and eventful career.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include therein an address I delivered in Indianapolis on June 24.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered. There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask permission for the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] to extend his remarks by publishing a report from the conference committee on national debt policy.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered. There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include a letter from one of my constituents.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

JOHN L. LEWIS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

PAGE MR. MURPHY AND THE SENATE CIVIL LIBERTIES COMMITTEE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I notice the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], who the other day said I had an attack of "Lewisitis." That is becoming epidemic the country over.

Not so long ago Attorney General Murphy announced the organization of a new unit in the Department of Justice to investigate the denial of civil liberties. He and the Senate Civil Liberties Committee have long been on the trail of employers who thought they had a right to give men jobs and pay them wages.

Yesterday's press carries the news that 3,000 pickets fought Cleveland police and firemen who were endeavoring to open the way so that men might go to and from their work.

Attorney General Murphy's attention is called to a statement of Mr. Joseph Bagano, strike leader, who predicted more fighting during the afternoon when nonstrikers inside the plants came off duty. His prediction was fulfilled. He knew what he intended to do, and he did it; more than 40 men were sent to the hospital.

According to the press Mr. Bagano said:

We will continue to throw stones, turn over cars, and resist these "scabs" until they get religion and stay home where they belong.

He made good his threat, cars were overturned, windows were broken, and there was fighting all along the line.

John L. Lewis is the big boss who directs the activities of Bagano and his associates. Lewis is Murphy's friend. Murphy is Lewis' friend, together they kept the sit-down strikes going in Michigan for 44 days; a record for loss of wages, destruction of property, and denial of civil liberty. If Murphy does not want to stand convicted before the Nation at large of being a hypocrite, one who winks at and ignores the wholesale violation of civil liberties, let him get busy with his new division in his Department of Justice, restore civil liberties to those men of Cleveland who want to exercise their constitutional right to work.

The press carries the information that one of the strike leaders was appealing to Murphy to prevent the police from interfering with the strikers who were obstructing the streets and preventing men from working. Murphy did as Governor aid Lewis in violating the law in the Michigan strikes, but if he as Attorney General aids the C. I. O. in clubbing the police of Cleveland into submission and aids in preventing men going about their daily tasks, he should be impeached.

Bagano and his associates are inciting to riot, throwing stones, breaking windows, sending people to the hospital with bodily injuries. These are criminal acts and the authorities would do well to bring criminal charges against the ring leaders—Lewis, Bagano, and their associates—who boss the job and incite others to violence.

As Raymond Clapper, always friendly with the New Deal, advised some time ago: Let Murphy, the administration's glamor boy, get off his airplanes, quit traveling around the country, "forget the ballyhoo and knuckle down to work." [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered. There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] loves to address me, and I welcome it; but I want to say to him that I have not heard Mr. Lewis make the statement, and I do not believe everything I read in the Republican newspapers. Personally, I feel that not all of the people all of the time agree with Mr. Lewis. I do not want to say that I have at all times agreed with what he has said. Nevertheless, he represents the cause of certain heretofore unorganized labor, and I hope that within a short space of time he will be able to merge his organization with the American Federation of Labor, and they will then have a real organization that the gentleman from Michigan will not be able or willing to assail and attack as he has.

As to Attorney General Murphy, he does not need any defense at my hands, and I am satisfied he is a pretty good man. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

[Mr. ALLEN of Illinois addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point, and to include an editorial from the Chicago Tribune on the subject of hogs and lard.

The SPEAKER. The Chair cannot entertain the gentleman's request to extend his remarks at this point.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I modify my request and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, to include certain extraneous matters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein certain newspaper excerpts from Argentine papers and certain statistical figures from the department.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to incorporate therein a copy of a radio address made by myself last Saturday evening.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the Customs Service, which was established 150 years ago today, on August 1, 1789.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter received by me from Chairman John H. Fahey, of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, it did me a lot of good this morning to hear so many speeches, some of them coming from the Democratic side of the House, saying that we cannot go on with this enormous spending program this administration has started and expect this country to survive. When I heard the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. COFFEY] a few moments ago on the Democratic side of the House start talking economy it certainly did my heart good. I hope more Members from that side of the House will plead for economy in government. We must have it if we are to save this Nation of ours and protect the Treasury. We should vote right today on the spending, squandering bill. Let us see that we do vote economy today.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the Speaker and the majority leader will come out now and publicly advocate economy. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 seconds.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I want the RECORD to show sometime, by votes, how the gentleman from Pennsylvania stands on expenditures and not so much conversation, because conversation does not mean a thing, but the record of votes proves action. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RICH. I hope the gentleman will look at the votes, for he will find me voting for economy.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to include therein a speech delivered by Judge Davenport at Goliad, Tex., at the unveiling of a monument and the dedication of a park celebrating the downfall of Goliad in the war of Texas independence.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and ninety-one Members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House. A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

LXXXIV—676

[Roll No. 150]

Barnes	Drewry	McLean	Rockefeller
Bolton	Eaton, Calif.	McLeod	Sacks
Boren	Eaton, N. J.	McMillan, Thos. S.	Schaefer, Ill.
Bradley, Pa.	Edmiston	Rockefeller	Schwert
Brewster	Evans	Magnuson	Secrest
Bulwinkle	Ferguson	Marshall	Sheppard
Byrne, N. Y.	Fernandez	Martin, Colo.	Short
Caldwell	Fish	Massingale	Smith, Ill.
Chapman	Fitzpatrick	Mitchell	Snyder
Cluett	Harrington	Myers	Somers, N. Y.
Collins	Hendricks	Nichols	Stearns, N. H.
Cooley	Hennings	Osmer	Stefan
Courtney	Holmes	O'Toole	Sullivan
Creal	Hook	Patman	Sumners, Tex.
Crowther	Hunter	Pierce, N. Y.	Sweeney
Culkin	Kennedy, Martin	Powers	Thill
Cummings	Lanham	Rabaut	White, Idaho
Curley	Lemke	Reece, Tenn.	Winter
Dies	Lesinski	Reed, N. Y.	Wood
Dingell	McGranery	Robison, Ky.	Woodruff, Mich.

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and forty-eight Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

On motion of Mr. RAYBURN, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

LIABILITY OF RAILROADS TO THEIR EMPLOYEES

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 1708) to amend the Employers' Liability Act, and I shall offer an amendment striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting the provisions of H. R. 4988, which was passed by the House yesterday.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER]?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I understand it, this bill passed the House yesterday and a Senate bill was passed by the Senate. There is a little difference between the two bills. The purpose of this procedure is to make the parliamentary situation such that the bill may go to conference.

Mr. CELLER. That is correct.

Mr. MICHENER. It is a very meritorious bill and should go to conference.

Mr. WALTER. The Senate bill contains the provisions of a bill that our committee unanimously reported yesterday, and it can be incorporated in this measure.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 1, 4, and 6, chapter 149 (35 Stat. 65, act of April 22, 1908), are hereby amended so as to read as follows:

"SECTION 1. That every common carrier by railroad while engaging in commerce between any of the several States or Territories, or between any of the States and Territories, or between the District of Columbia and any of the States or Territories, or between the District of Columbia or any of the States or Territories and any foreign nation or nations, shall be liable in damages to any person suffering injury while he is employed by such carrier in such commerce, or, in case of the death of such employee, to his or her personal representative, for the benefit of the surviving widow or husband and children of such employee; and, if none, then of such employee's parents; and, if none, then of the next of kin dependent upon such employee, for such injury or death resulting in whole or in part from the negligence of any of the officers, agents, or employees of such carrier, or by reason of any defect or insufficiency, due to its negligence, in its cars, engines, appliances, machinery, track, roadbed, works, boats, wharves, or other equipment.

"Any employee of a carrier, any part of whose duties as such employee shall be the furtherance of interstate or foreign commerce; or shall, in any way directly or closely and substantially, affect such commerce as above set forth shall, for the purposes of this act, be considered as being employed by such carrier in such commerce and shall be considered as entitled to the benefits of this act and of an act entitled 'An act relating to the liability of common carriers by railroad to their employees in certain cases' (approved April 22, 1908), as the same has been or may hereafter be amended."

"SEC. 4. That in any action brought against any common carrier under or by virtue of any of the provisions of this act to recover damages for injuries to, or the death of, any of its employees, such employee shall not be held to have assumed the risks of his employment in any case where such injury or death resulted in whole or in part from the negligence of any of the officers, agents, or employees of such carrier; and no employee shall be held to have

assumed the risks of his employment in any case where the violation by such common carrier of any statute enacted for the safety of employees contributed to the injury or death of such employee.

"Sec. 6. That no action shall be maintained under this act unless commenced within 2 years from the day the cause of action accrued.

"Under this act an action may be brought in a district court of the United States, in the district of the residence of the defendant, or in which the defendant shall be doing business at the time of commencing such action. The jurisdiction of the courts of the United States under this act shall be concurrent with that of the courts of the several States, and no case arising under this act and brought in any State court of competent jurisdiction shall be removed to any court of the United States.

"Any contract, rule, regulation, or device whatsoever, the purpose, intent, or effect of which shall be to prevent employees of any common carrier from furnishing, voluntarily, information to a person in interest or his representative as to the facts incident to the injury or death of any employee, shall be void, and whoever, by threat, intimidation, order, rule, contract, regulation, or device whatsoever, shall attempt to prevent any person from furnishing such information, or whoever discharges or otherwise disciplines or attempts to discipline any employee for furnishing such information shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both fined and imprisoned for each offense.

"If any provision of this act is declared unconstitutional or the applicability thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the act and the applicability of such provision to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby."

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CELLER: Strike out all after the enacting clause of the Senate bill and insert the following:

"That section 1 of the act entitled 'An act relating to the liability of common carriers by railroad for their employees in certain cases,' approved April 22, 1908 (35 Stat. 65; U. S. C., title 45, sec. 51), be, and it is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"That every common carrier by railroad while engaging in commerce between any of the several States or Territories, or between any of the States and Territories, or between the District of Columbia and any of the States or Territories, or between the District of Columbia or any of the States or Territories and any foreign nation or nations, shall be liable in damages to any person suffering injury while he is employed by such carrier in such commerce, or, in case of the death of such employee, to his or her personal representative, for the benefit of the surviving widow or husband and children of such employee; and, if none, then of such employee's parents; and, if none, then of the next of kin dependent upon such employee, for such injury or death resulting in whole or in part from the negligence of any of the officers, agents, or employees of such carrier, or by reason of any defect or insufficiency, due to its negligence, in its cars, engines, appliances, machinery, track, roadbed, works, boats, wharves, or other equipment. In any action brought against any common carrier under or by virtue of any of the provisions of this act to recover damages for injuries to, or the death of, any of its employees, such employee shall not be held to have assumed the risks of his employment in any case where said employee has not had actual notice of any negligently maintained condition or practice where the negligence of such common carrier, its officers, agents, or employees, proximately contributed to the injury or death of such employees except those risks incident to the employment."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONSTRUCTION AND FINANCING OF SELF-LIQUIDATING PROJECTS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 286 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

House Resolution 286

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 7120, a bill to provide for the construction and financing of self-liquidating projects, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 5 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute committee amendment recommended by the Committee on Banking and Currency now in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the 5-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous ques-

tion shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MAPES. My understanding is that the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is to make a point of order against the rule on another question from what I have in mind and I wish to preserve his right to do that.

The SPEAKER. Upon what proposition?

Mr. MAPES. I say my understanding is that the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is to make a point of order against the rule on another question.

The SPEAKER. On the rule now pending?

Mr. MAPES. Yes. I desire to preserve his rights, but for the protection of the Committee on Rules I think I should call attention to the fact that this rule is reported by the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency [Mr. STEAGALL].

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman from Michigan now making a point of order against the resolution?

Mr. MAPES. I make a point of order for the purpose really of submitting a parliamentary inquiry to the Speaker. Frankly, I do not care to press the point of order, but I desire to call attention to the matter. I knew there was no member of the Committee on Rules who was enthusiastic about this rule or the legislation.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman submit his parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. MAPES. But I did not know there was no member who was willing to attach his name to the report of the committee. May I ask the Speaker if it is proper procedure, or parliamentary, for a Member of the House not a member of the Rules Committee to report a rule from the Committee on Rules?

The SPEAKER. The Chair is prepared to rule on the parliamentary inquiry.

The attention of the Chair has been called to this matter. It appears from the print of the resolution that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL], of the Committee on Rules, reported the resolution. The record shows, however, that the chairman of the Committee on Rules [Mr. SABATH] did, as a matter of fact, report the rule. It is evident to the Chair that the incorporation of the name "Mr. STEAGALL" was a clerical or typographical error, and the Chair would so hold if a point of order were made against it.

Mr. MAPES. I think the Speaker's decision is correct, but I felt the attention of the House should be called to the error.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order against certain sections of the bill referred to in the rule.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman desire to make a point of order against the resolution?

Mr. TABER. Against certain sections of the bill referred to in the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will not entertain that point of order, because the matter now pending before the House is whether or not it should agree to the resolution making a certain bill in order.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call the attention of the Chair to certain precedents on this matter.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, no part of the bill is now before the House. The question now is on the adoption of the rule.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York has asked the indulgence of the Chair to present precedents upon the point of order he offers to raise against the bill reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency, the consideration of which the pending rule proposes to make in order.

Mr. TABER. The point of order is against certain sections of the bill, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the Chair to the fact that under the rule, line 6, all points of order against the bill are waived. If the rule should be

adopted, it would be impossible to make these points of order.

I wish to call attention to paragraph 2142 in volume 7 of Cannon's Precedents, 1936, page 884. There on a Calendar Wednesday, without the bill having been read for amendment and without there having been general debate, after the bill was called up—and the calling up of this resolution is equivalent to the calling up of the bill—a point of order was raised against the bill. The point of order was overruled. Thereupon Mr. Newton made a point of order against the particular items of appropriation in the bill without the bill having been read for amendment, or anything of that kind, and the Speaker sustained the point of order. This appears on page 3664 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, fourth session, Sixty-seventh Congress.

A similar situation arose during the consideration of a bill from the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. There a point of order was raised during general debate without the bill having been read for amendment. This appears on page 891 of the same volume—7 Cannon's Precedents, section 2148—with reference to a bill providing for the payment of certain funds out of appropriations already made for motor-vehicle service.

These situations are exactly like the situation that is presented here. I desire at this time to make a point of order against certain sections in the bill it is proposed to take up for consideration.

THE SPEAKER. The Chair is ready to rule on the point of order.

The Chair has no disposition to limit the argument of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], but the Chair is very clearly of the opinion that the points of order the gentleman seeks to raise against certain provisions of the bill are not in order at this time. The House is now considering a resolution providing for the consideration of the bill against which the gentleman desires to raise certain points of order. The resolution which is now being considered itself provides, if adopted, that all points of order against the bill are waived. This is no innovation or new matter. Time after time the Committee on Rules has brought to the House resolutions waiving points of order against bills. Under the general rules of the House, the Chair will say to the gentleman, aside from the considerations which the Chair has mentioned, points of order cannot be raised against the bill until the section is reached in the bill which attempts to make appropriations and against which the point of order is desired to be made.

For those reasons the Chair does not feel like recognizing the gentleman at this juncture to state points of order against the proposed bill.

MR. TABER. May I call the attention of the Chair to the last sentence in clause 4 of rule XXI:

A question of order on an appropriation in any such bill, joint resolution, or amendment thereto may be raised at any time.

There have been decisions holding that the point of order would not lie to the bill or to its consideration, but I have cited to the Chair cases where such points of order have been made and have been sustained when the bill itself was not under consideration.

THE SPEAKER. The Chair has undertaken to make it plain that the Chair's decision is based very largely upon the proposition that the resolution now being considered specifically waives all points of order that may be made against the bill, and includes those matters evidently against which the gentleman has in mind in making points of order.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

MR. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

THE SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

MR. SABATH. I yield, Mr. Speaker.

THE SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

MR. KNUTSON. I have observed that the resolution has been reported by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL].

MR. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, we have already been over that matter. Another gentleman on that side brought up the point.

MR. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

MR. SABATH. I yield, Mr. Speaker.

MR. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, is the effect of the Speaker's ruling that the only remedy then would be to beat the rule?

THE SPEAKER. That is a matter not for the Speaker to decide but for the House itself to decide.

MR. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I assume the gentleman from Michigan desires some time, so I yield him the usual 30 minutes, which I feel he is not going to use.

MR. MAPES. Our distinguished chairman is very courteous. I may say to the chairman that I would like a little time.

MR. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, ladies, and gentlemen, I hope you will all bear with me today. I have had a hard siege of it. I am not going to detain you long, and I hope you will give me the attention to which I feel I am entitled while I explain the need for this rule.

Personally, Mr. Speaker, I do not believe I can do better than to restate at the very beginning that this rule is a broad, open, and liberal one. It provides for 5 hours of general debate, and that after the general debate, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. I personally believe that the title of the bill itself concisely and accurately explains the purpose of the proposed legislation. It states:

That this act may be cited as the "Self-Liquidating Project Act of 1939."

Sec. 2. In order to provide a sound method of financing which, without burdening the national taxing power, will make it possible to increase employment through a self-liquidating improvement program the Reconstruction Finance Corporation (herein called the "Corporation"), upon the direction of the President, shall issue from time to time notes, debentures, bonds, or other obligations to enable the Department of Agriculture, the Public Roads Administration, the Public Works Administration, the Rural Electrification Administration, and the Corporation to carry out their respective functions as herein provided.

This short paragraph, Mr. Speaker, explains the purpose of this important legislation. The bill authorizes \$350,000,000 for public-works loans to municipalities and States for construction of schools, hospitals, and other improvements necessary and badly needed.

It authorizes \$250,000,000 to the R. F. C. for railroad equipment on a 10-year basis.

It authorizes \$350,000,000 for rural electrification.

It authorizes \$400,000,000 under which the Department of Agriculture may provide for rural rehabilitation, farm tenancy loans, and, in general, aid and assist the tenants and the farmers of this Nation.

It authorizes \$500,000,000 for public roads, of which \$230,000,000 is to be temporarily advanced to the States to enable them to match the amounts required for the allocations granted them.

In addition, there is a provision which authorizes an additional \$100,000,000 for the Export-Import Bank.

All these authorizations for loans will not be a burden on the Government. They are all for self-liquidating projects, and after a careful investigation and examination I am satisfied that most of this money will be repaid to the Government.

Those who charge that the Government will sustain a loss in advancing this money are deliberately and willfully overlooking the fact that all these loans are to be amply secured. There can be hardly any loss. And even conceding that some losses may result from R. F. C. loans that have been made in the past, it is well to remember that those were loans which were approved and made during the Republican administration. In the present bill it is provided that loans made to the railroads will be secured by the Government retaining title to the equipment purchased by means of such loans. The \$230,000,000 loan for highways will be deducted from the amounts regularly allocated to the respective

States that are not able at the present time to match the amounts the Government puts up for such purposes.

The bill provides that the Government shall charge one-half percent above the interest it will pay on this money, and if there should be some few losses that one-half percent should take care of them. However, even if there should be a few losses, the great benefits that will accrue to millions of Americans will more than offset them.

Therefore I am amazed, Mr. Speaker, at the reckless statements of the gentlemen on the left side. I am surprised that gentlemen opposing for political reasons this needed legislation which will create over 500,000 jobs, should be guilty of misstatement and, in fact, misrepresentations about what this bill will accomplish.

This does not mean a great deal to my district directly, and if I should personally be called upon to give a title to the bill I would call it an agricultural aid and relief bill for the aid and assistance of the rural sections of our country. No bill that I can recall during all the long years that I have had the honor to serve here has tended to do more for the rural sections of our country than this bill.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman care to yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman for a question.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The gentleman is amazingly frank in his statement that the bill is an agricultural relief bill, but does the gentleman think that the program originally sent down to the Congress was contemplated as an agricultural relief proposal?

Mr. SABATH. Well, unfortunately, I am obliged to admit that certain forces at work in this House, as well as in the other body, utilize every opportunity to eliminate from any proposed legislation all benefits to the urban population or for the unemployed of the cities. I still feel, notwithstanding that it is a farmer and rural section relief bill, eventually the people in the cities will derive some benefit because of the employment that this legislation will create.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SABATH. I cannot yield now, please.

Mr. BARDEN. We do not want to fuss with the gentleman, but we do want a little information.

Mr. SABATH. I will give that to the gentleman later on, if I can.

Mr. Speaker, this morning in the Well here we heard from two or three gentlemen; unfortunately, disgruntled Democrats complaining of our expenditures and about the conditions in our Nation. To them I desire to say this. Yes, we have appropriated money, although we are not appropriating any in this bill, and we have also expended money in the interest of the people and not in the interest of any Member or anyone connected with the administration. All these moneys that have been appropriated were in the interest of America and for the unemployed, for American business and American institutions. The result, I am proud to say, is—and these figures cannot be contradicted—that due to our spending, the American people today have in the banks of the United States, which includes the national and State banks, over \$43,000,000,000 of deposits. Over \$53,000,000,000 of deposits in the banks of the United States. Twenty-three billion, three hundred and forty million in the national banks, and in other banks, \$30,472,000,000 in the national and State banks, over \$53,000,000,000 of deposits, but I repeat, \$54,000,000,000.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Can the gentleman inform the House what part of that \$53,000,000,000 is represented by the deposits of one bank in another bank?

Mr. SABATH. That is not included. If I had included what the gentleman believes is included, the amount would have been \$62,000,000,000, but I have eliminated that, and only after careful research I came to the conclusion that the amount of \$54,000,000,000 is correct.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. Later on, not now.

Mr. WOLCOTT. But at this point.

Mr. SABATH. Not at this point.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. SABATH. Notwithstanding the fact that these billions are deposited in our banks, that the vaults of the banks are bulging with currency, with money, the bankers of this country have refused and are refusing to come to the rescue of business or agriculture or anyone. They are keeping the money locked up. For what reasons I do not know, but it is for that purpose that this Government is obliged to aid industry and help business and help the farmers, because the bankers, controlled from Wall Street, have refused and are refusing to do so. I feel that that in itself is positive evidence that the spending on the part of this administration, by this Congress, was in the right direction, was constructive, and, Mr. Speaker, that should be constantly borne in mind by fair-minded persons who recognize results instead of political speeches.

Mr. Speaker and you gentlemen, do you not know that the income of the United States in 1932 was \$40,000,000,000? In 1933 it was \$42,000,000,000, and in the year 1939 it is estimated it will be \$68,000,000,000.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. Not now, as I am giving the House and the country information willfully withheld from them.

Mr. Speaker, the income to the people of the United States under President Roosevelt's Democratic administration has increased in 6 years by \$28,000,000,000, and only the day before yesterday I read in the Evening Star newspaper of Washington a statement showing that the increases continue and that the national income is growing daily. Surely no one will charge the Washington Star, or any other paper in this city, with being Democratic and printing any false propaganda in the interest of President Roosevelt's policy, or the New Deal.

Please understand, and I am extremely anxious that the country should know, that the annual national income or the yearly national income—I want to make it as plain as I can—is \$28,000,000,000 higher per year than it was in 1932. And, Mr. Speaker, I am satisfied that by the end of 1939 there will be shown a thirty billion increase. Thus if you Republicans had the interest of the country at heart and would not retard the President's efforts and our efforts it will be increased in 1940 to thirty-five billions, and before the President's term will expire it will reach nearly eighty billions, which will be more than double the national income in 1932. So when you talk of spending and talk of increased bonded indebtedness won't you please at some time be honest and fair and admit that our annual or yearly income is greater than the total increased debt during the 6 years of Roosevelt's administration. In other words, we have increased our debt by a total of only about \$20,000,000,000, yet are increasing our income—that is each year—by \$30,000,000,000.

Mr. Speaker, now I am going to ask some of the financiers on the Republican side and some of the expert Democrat economists: Would you not be willing to borrow \$20,000,000,000 if by so doing you could increase your wealth by \$30,000,000,000 every year? I ask you—answer it if you can—is not that good business for the American people? To make it clear so that the most uninformed person may understand—would you not be willing to invest \$20 if that \$20 would bring back to you every year not 6 percent or 8 percent, but 100 percent and 150 percent? Why do you not tell that to the people? Why do not your Republican newspapers bring that home to the people? Why do you not show them the truth, that the Democratic investment of \$20,000,000,000 in the welfare of America has increased national income to a new record high point? Why not give them the facts, instead of repeating like a Charlie McCarthy the whines and complaints of big tax dodgers and millionaires?

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I am sorry, but I cannot. Maybe later on. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I feel that the spending and the expenditure made were no doubt incurred in the interest of the American people, in the interest of our country. I am

not at this time going back to describe to you the conditions in 1932 when President Roosevelt was elected, nor the conditions in '33 when he was sworn in as President. I know you remember the unfortunate conditions, but the Republican leadership wants to forget those desperate days, and consequently they are obliged to coin new words, new sentences, new paragraphs, to give to the Republican newspapers an opportunity for new headlines. But I say to you, Mr. Speaker, if the Republican press, and if the Republicans here would be sincere with the people of the United States, if they honestly desired to improve conditions and reemploy the people who have been unfortunately thrown out of employment on account of their own destructive misrule, they would be then serving a righteous cause, and they would be placed in the position of real statesmen, men who place the interest and welfare of our country above politics and their own political and personal fortunes.

The vote of every Democrat, regardless of whether he hales from the North or the South, the East or the West, elected on the Democratic ticket, under the leadership of President Roosevelt, should be for this bill. I do not expect a single vote from the Republicans. They are not accustomed to vote in the interest of the common people. They promise the farmer and the laboring people everything before election. They pledge themselves to vote for legislation in the interest of the people, but when the time comes they vote against it as they always have done before. It is because of these tactics that they were properly driven from office in 1932 and will be kept out of office so long as Democrats stand by and support the honest efforts of President Roosevelt. If you Republicans and some reactionary Democrats think you can discourage the President in his determined efforts to improve the conditions of the underprivileged, the farmer, the wage earner, and honest businessmen, you have another guess coming. Your opposition is a stimulant to him, and he will, yes, he must continue the fight of the people and for the people. He has embarked on the path of making America a better place to live in for Americans and the people will continue to give him their overwhelming support in his efforts. You may delay and obstruct his great program, but you will not and cannot stop it, for the people will not be fooled. They will stop your obstruction and sabotage of his great liberal program when you face them at the polls next year.

Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen, I cannot help to express my condemnation, and I feel you must feel as I do when you have seen men in despair and on the verge of bankruptcy and ruin, who, after being saved by the New Deal and reestablished, and who are now deriving a greater income than in the balmy days of 1928 and early 1929, will find fault and condemn the very man who put them on their feet.

I feel that this legislation is of such importance that it is not necessary to dwell any longer on the provisions of the bill. I have here a short résumé from the hearings in the other body, as well as the hearings in this body, showing the benefits that will accrue to our industries. While these benefits primarily are directed to the rural areas of the country, eventually the wage earners in the city will also derive at least indirect benefit from this legislation. I have it on good authority, Mr. Speaker, that this program and this policy, when it goes into effect, will bring reemployment of at least 500,000 men directly, and very likely an additional half million indirectly. In view of that fact, if gentlemen are desirous of reducing the funds for the relief of the American people which the special interests complain about so much, and especially the big boys who have made more money in 1938 and are making more in 1939 than ever before in the history of America, then I say to you that our duty is plain. You should disregard the objections that these big profiteers and tax evaders are using to mislead you. I feel this legislation should receive the approval of every sincere and honest American legislator. There should be no politics in this House about reemploying 1,000,000 men. There should be no politics in relieving

and saving perhaps 250,000 farmers who are about to lose their farms, because under this bill it is intended to save the farmers who are about to be evicted from their farms, where already foreclosure proceedings have been commenced or at least threatened. In view of those facts I hope the resolution will receive the vote and support of all those honestly and sincerely trying to restore the prosperity of America. I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I can see two sides to most legislative questions, but, frankly, I cannot see any justification whatever for this legislation at this time. I can see how it would be very dangerous at any time, but it is both dangerous and useless at this time. If there is any public demand for it, if there is any need for it, or if there is any reasonable justification for it, it was not disclosed at the hearings before the Committee on Rules. In fact, it was affirmatively shown at those hearings that there is no public demand for it, that there is really no need for it, and that there is no reasonable justification for it.

Briefly, the bill proposes to give the Reconstruction Finance Corporation authority to issue and sell its bonds or securities to an additional amount of \$1,850,000,000 above what it is now authorized to do, and to allocate the money thus obtained to certain governmental agencies already provided under the regular appropriations with all the money they need or can use efficiently. The bill covers a wide field. The different subjects covered by it for the most part have been considered for years, and intensively so, by standing committees of the House having jurisdiction of them, other than the Committee on Banking and Currency, which reports this bill, and in many instances these committees have refused to report legislation such as is contained in this bill.

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce reported the Lea transportation bill a few weeks ago, after consideration by that committee for 6 months. There was criticism by the opponents of that legislation because it was brought on the floor so late in the session. It covered only one subject, namely, transportation, a subject over which the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has jurisdiction under the rules and to which it gives constant attention and study. This bill, which contains many subjects of equal or greater importance, was reported to the House of Representatives on July 31, 1939, according to the committee print, and it is now exactly 1:30 p. m., August 1, 1939. The rule was reported last night by the Committee on Rules at 5:45 p. m. At that time the committee substitute had not been printed. The committee report was not before the Committee on Rules. My office tried this morning every few minutes, beginning at 8:45, to get a printed copy of the report of the committee, and to get a printed copy of the committee substitute, but did not succeed in doing so until 10:30 o'clock. That is as long as anyone has had to study the bill and the report.

A copy of the hearings before the committee was delivered to me after I came on the floor this afternoon. We are asked to consider this legislation, under these conditions, legislation over which other committees naturally have jurisdiction and to which they have given consideration for years.

Why do I say that the legislation is not needed? Because the hearings before the Committee on Rules disclosed that practically all, if not all, of the governmental agencies that will be assigned the money that is secured from the sale of these additional securities of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation already have surpluses at their disposal given them under the regular appropriation laws. That is true of the Rural Electrification Administration. That is true of the Bureau of Roads. It is true of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, as far as making loans to railroads is concerned. I think it is true of the other governmental agencies involved also.

Now, what does this bill propose to do? It proposes to give these agencies that already have more than they can make efficient use of under the regular appropriations of the

Congress, this additional money and say to them, "Here it is. Spend it. Waste it." [Applause.]

I call the attention of the Members of the different committees to some of the things that are in this bill over which their committees have jurisdiction. To repeat, the bill authorizes the raising of \$1,850,000,000. I see some members of the Committee on Appropriations here. Let them ponder this provision:

Departments, administrations, and agencies for which funds shall be provided by the Corporation, pursuant to this act—

Namely, \$1,850,000,000—

may use such funds for the purposes of carrying out their respective functions under this act without further appropriations, and such funds shall be continuously available for such purposes.

I call the attention of the Committee on Agriculture to the farm-tenancy provision of the bill. It authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to use \$400,000,000 of the funds for that purpose. My understanding is that the Committee on Agriculture has refused to vote out a bill incorporating a similar provision.

I call the attention of the Committee on Agriculture to the further provision which authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to refinance farm mortgages on which payments periodically due, exceed the normal farm income available for debt service. That is nearly all-inclusive. That is entirely new. It is a radical departure from any existing law. Still, it is here. We are obliged to pass on it without having a chance to read the bill or the hearings or the committee report. It has never been recommended by the Committee on Agriculture.

Now, coming to the jurisdiction of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, this bill authorizes the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to raise \$250,000,000 to buy railroad equipment and to rent or lease that equipment to the railroads. The provision on this subject reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House is a little different, but not materially so, from the one discussed in the Senate, and it was stated there that it was proposed by it to put the Government into the junk business.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAPES. I cannot yield now. I do not have the time. Mr. Pelley, who is president of the Association of American Railroads, according to the proceedings in the Senate, said there was no need of any such provision.

I asked some of the witnesses before the Committee on Rules who recommended the provision, and I was unable to find that anybody recommended it. The railroads can get money more easily for equipment than for anything else. Besides, they do not need additional equipment; they have more equipment now than they can make use of. What the railroads need is business; yet here is a provision inserted in this bill reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency, a committee that has no jurisdiction of the subject matter, authorizing the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to buy additional equipment for them. Let me read from the RECORD what the distinguished Chairman of the Committee on Interstate Commerce of the Senate said in regard to this matter. On page 10336 of the RECORD, Senator WHEELER said this:

The Committee on Interstate Commerce has studied this problem of railroad finance for the last 2 or 3 years. There was never the slightest intimation of this proposal brought to the attention of any member of our committee. We were never consulted about it in any way, shape, or form; and I am sure that every member of the committee who knows anything about it would have been unanimous against a proposition of this kind.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. MAPES. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. I want it emphatically presented here that this is the lay-out: I am sure the railroads can borrow money of the R. F. C. for equipment. Is it not true that under this bill the R. F. C. will buy the junk and then can turn around after they get title and sell it to the railroads

on a lease proposition to buy better railroad equipment and leave the junk by the roadside?

Mr. MAPES. I tried to make that clear.

Mr. GIFFORD. It must be made clear.

Mr. MAPES. In substance what the gentleman has stated is correct.

If anybody questions the self-liquidating feature of the projects proposed, let him turn to the first section of the bill. That should allay any doubts he may have on that score—

This act may be cited as a self-liquidating projects act of 1939.

In other words, it must be so, because it is so declared by the drafters of the bill. Here is the way this self-liquidating matter works as far as the item for highway purposes is concerned: The Bureau of Roads now has \$228,000,000 available under the regular appropriations for the States which they have been unable to match. How does this bill propose to collect \$230,000,000 of the amount that is appropriated for the Bureau of Roads? It proposes to advance to these States that have been unable to match the Federal contribution in the way of grants or loans, or gifts, \$230,000,000, so that they can match this \$228,000,000 that the Bureau of Roads now has. How is that to be paid back? It is to be paid back in this way: When Congress in the years to come makes appropriations for roads it is proposed that it will deduct one-tenth of the appropriation which would otherwise go to these States and apply that on the loan.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

As I said before the Committee on Rules, it is like a father who gives his son a weekly allowance of \$10. The boy comes to him and says: "Dad, I have got to have \$100 this week; won't you lend it to me and take \$5 out of my allowance for the next 20 weeks until it is paid back?" That is the way it is self-liquidating, as a member of the Committee on Rules retorted: "Yes, and when the time comes, Dad comes across with the same \$10 a week." When the time comes Congress will appropriate the same amount to these States that it appropriates to the other States and everybody in this House who has had any experience here knows that is exactly what will be done. Still this is called a self-liquidating measure.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, this bill is dangerous from any standpoint, and there is no necessity for it because most, if not all, of the agencies involved already have more money than they can use efficiently. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON].

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, it will be a sad day for our country if this Congress divides on party lines when the issues under consideration are primarily economic issues.

Being sound is no test of being a Democrat; being sound is no test of being a Republican. When we face an economic issue there should be but one question before us: Is it sound? Is it for the public welfare? If so, let support come from both sides of the aisle. [Applause.] But if it be unsound let no one try to question the man's party allegiance or loyalty because he dare raise his voice against it.

I went this morning to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules and asked for the privilege of speaking on this resolution and frankly said: "To speak against it." He said, "No Democrat will get time from me to speak against this resolution. If you want time go to the Republicans"; and that is where I went, to the Republicans, and I now express my appreciation of their courtesy in permitting me to express my views.

I do not propose to go into the items of expenditure in this bill.

I am willing to concede for the sake of argument that they may be desirable and that this fund will be efficiently, wisely, justly, and fairly handled. I am willing to concede that the purpose behind those who are sponsoring the bill is to promote the general welfare. But may I say that I do not agree

with the theory of John Maynard Keynes, who, being unable to sell his own government on the idea of spending for recovery, came over and sold some of our officials on that theory, notably the distinguished chairman of our Federal Reserve Board, Mr. Eccles.

What do we have before us? We can debate the rule on this bill until September and we will not develop any real new facts, nor will we change any votes. This rule ought to be defeated and we should end the argument right now. [Applause.] We cannot definitely decide whether or not we can spend our way to recovery. Only experience will demonstrate that. We can try some experiments and if they prove to be a failure we can repeal them, but we cannot repeal a debt.

Gentlemen may argue, and sincerely so—I do not question their motives—that that is the best way out. May I say that we have spent liberally for the past 7 years and it has not brought us out. I believe the theory is wrong.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I want to call the gentleman's attention to sections 10 and 15 of this bill. Congress recently in its wisdom required the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, the Electric Farm and Home Authority, and several other agencies that did their own financing and raised their own funds by the issuance of bonds to come to the Appropriations Committee of the Congress to have their appropriating and administrative expenses passed upon by the Congress. Section 15 of this bill permits those agencies to have their administrative expenses allocated by the Director of the Budget. Section 10 of the bill provides that the departments may use such funds—that is, the billion dollars allocated to them—for carrying out their respective purposes without further appropriation and such funds shall be continuously available for such purposes. May I say to the gentleman that is a revolutionary departure from our present procedure with reference to appropriations.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I agree with the gentleman. That is something, if the rule is not voted down, which we will have to consider when we get to it.

Here is my point. Only experience will demonstrate whether we can spend our way back to recovery. We have been spending, and even the advocates of that scheme must admit the results have not been what they predicted. We have already appropriated \$13,000,000,000 this year, and if we spend it, it will exceed the present limit of \$45,000,000,000 of national debt. Federal lending agencies, according to the Senate debate, can lend an additional \$7,000,000,000 under existing law.

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I will yield to the gentleman if he will give me more time.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute. Does the gentleman maintain that we have made no progress if the record and statistics show that we have increased our income from \$40,000,000,000 to \$68,000,000,000?

Mr. ROBERTSON. The gentleman knows I supported the first two recovery acts, the Home Owners' Loan Corporation Act, the Federal Housing Act, the Reconstruction Finance Act, the Farm Credit Administration Act, and numerous other lending measures of a temporary character. I was willing to go along in the midst of the depression and do a reasonable amount of spending to help out, but I think we have reached the point where we are not priming a business pump. When we put into this bill a provision that the R. F. C. can borrow money to manufacture and lease railroad equipment to the railroads, we are not priming a private pump. We are setting up a Government pump to compete with private business, which I do not think is sound. I think we have spent enough money. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am not approaching this matter in a partisan frame of mind, either. I am approaching it from the standpoint of the real economic problem that our country is confronted with.

On page 10604 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I have a speech in which I explain a certain amendment which I intend to offer to this bill later on, but to which I do not propose to refer right now in these brief 4 minutes. The thing I want to emphasize, if I can get it done in the 4 minutes, is that the general economic situation we face in this industrial civilization of ours can be summed up briefly thus: In order to have business prosperity you must have a consuming power flowing through the pockets of the people which is equivalent to the capacity of the Nation to produce wealth. We have a situation today where the volume of savings which accumulates year by year in the hands of a comparatively few people is so great that it tends to make it impossible for agriculture and industry to recapture the value of the goods and services that they have produced in that current year. This is probably the root cause of depression.

There are three or four different alternative ways of seeking a solution to that problem. One of them is the general method that is described roughly and, I think, erroneously, as the "restoration of confidence." By that method, you might once again induce people to put their money at the disposal of Wall Street and to make what will be called investments. But those investments will not be profitable unless the buying power of the people is large enough to purchase the additional volume of goods produced. And we will ultimately have to go through a period of inevitable bankruptcy, foreclosure, and liquidation of debt by that process. If you are not willing to go that way, and I am inclined to think hardly anybody would be willing to risk it for his country, then we must seek some other solution.

My own choice of methods is the establishment of a constitutional monetary system for the United States wherein Congress would issue the money of the Nation and maintain a dollar of stable value. We should establish a sound system of taxation, security, benefits, and pensions, which would give us an even flow of buying power, which has not been done up to this time.

If you are not willing to do that, then we must have a volume of governmental investment to match the failure of private investment to take place, or we will sink deeper and deeper into depression. If this governmental investment is going to occur in fields where there is no return from it, like many of our projects that we have undertaken, then the expenditure is a net subsidy to the business of the country, and must be a net addition to public debt.

If you do that, then there is no objection on the ground that you are interfering in any way with business, but the inevitable consequence is an increase in debt. If you are going to complain about one of these, and insist on keeping the present debt-money system, then you cannot complain about the other.

The bill we have before us, without going into the details of it, is an attempt to accomplish the purpose of compensating for the failure of private investment by means of Government investment but without an increase in public debt. It is an attempt to accomplish the same purpose by making investments in fields where there can be a return. You have your choice between doing it that way and getting a return, and saving an increase in the public debt, or else having to do it in ways where you get no return and where inevitably the public debt is increased. The amendment which I shall offer would, indeed, avoid any sale of bonds at all by the R. F. C. and would thus cause this program to yield a net income to the Treasury. It is explained on page 10606.

The problem of America remains and will remain regardless of what you do with this bill, and the responsibility of this Congress is evidently to meet that problem. Already a cut of one-third has been made in the rolls of W. P. A. If this bill by any chance should be defeated, it then becomes the evident duty of this Congress to do something about

the employment problem of the people of America right now. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time, 8 minutes, to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT].

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, there is no need for this legislation to accomplish the purposes expressed in the bill. It has been charged that this is a subterfuge to raise money outside the debt limit without any restriction whatsoever by the Congress upon the expenditure of the money. The reason for it is undoubtedly predicated upon the fact that the national debt is today about \$40,500,000,000. The President in the estimates he sent to the Congress stated that at the end of the fiscal year 1940 the public debt will be approximately \$44,457,000,000, or a shade under the debt limitation which Congress has placed upon the debt of \$45,000,000,000.

Mr. Speaker, if money can be raised in this unorthodox manner for the purposes of this bill, there is no reason whatsoever why money cannot be raised in this manner to carry on the administrative functions of the Government. How is this money raised? It is raised by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, by the sale of its bonds. The money raised by the sale of the bonds of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is then placed in the Treasury of the United States and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has no more jurisdiction over it after it is placed in the Treasury of the United States. So all the publicity which has been given to the fact that these expenditures are to be made under the direction of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is at the least an exaggeration and is not based on the facts. With the exception of the amount of money which will be allocated back to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for railroad loans and for the lease of railroad equipment, the R. F. C. will have nothing to say about how this money is expended.

What does this bill do? In short and in fact, it abrogates the authority of the Congress to control the raising of money. It abrogates the authority of Congress to control the use to which the taxpayers' money is put, and in practice it delegates to the executive branch of the Government the constitutional prerogatives of Congress to appropriate money. It evades by indirection and subterfuge clause 7, section 9, article I, of the Constitution, which states that no money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in consequence of appropriation made by law.

Is there any need to pass this measure to accomplish this purpose? Let me tell you something about the specific items in the bill. In the original bill we provided \$750,000,000 for roads. There is at present in the Treasury of the United States \$228,000,000 of unused allocations which may be used under the Federal Highway Act if matched by the States. We can thaw that out without raising any new money the same as we did thaw out \$80,000,000 of it in 1930 for that purpose. It is not necessary, therefore, to raise one more cent for highways, and we can at the same time make available \$456,000,000 with the cooperation of the States.

With respect to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the loans to the railroads, I do not want you to rely upon my statement that no more money is needed. Let us refer to the hearings and see what Mr. Jesse Jones has to say about this. On page 186 of the hearings you will find the following:

Mr. WOLCOTT. Do you see any particular reason for authorizing the \$500,000,000, if you are not going to need more than a third of it for this next year?

Mr. JONES. I think that is for you to determine.

Mr. WOLCOTT. If we amended the existing law by providing, as has been recommended to the Senate committee with respect to leases of railroad equipment, you would have ample money under your present authorization to make these loans next year?

Mr. JONES. If you take off the existing limitation; yes.

Mr. WOLCOTT. So you do not need any part of this \$500,000,000 if we allow you to lease this equipment?

Mr. JONES. I think we would have ample.

Mr. Speaker, are we going to crowd down the throats of these agencies money they do not want and that they say they do not need to carry out the purposes of this legislation? [Applause.]

With respect to the Rural Electrification Administration, \$500,000,000 was asked in the original bill. We cut it to \$350,000,000, and all the President wants, according to the Secretary of the Treasury is \$20,000,000. We have enacted a program by which the R. E. A. may make loans up to \$40,000,000 for each of 9 years. This started in 1927. Mr. Carmody, appearing before the Committee on Banking and Currency, said that we will not know until these projects have been energized for at least 5 years whether or not they will be self-liquidating. According to the provisions of this bill, which compels them to find that the projects will be self-liquidating, there cannot be allocated one cent of the money which is to be available for R. E. A., because there is not one R. E. A. project at the present time, according to the testimony, which is self-liquidating, and we will not know for the next 3 years whether or not these projects are self-liquidating.

Now, with respect to the Export-Import Bank we raise the capital \$100,000,000 and Mr. Jones said, as late as this last spring, if he were given \$125,000,000 altogether he would have ample funds to function during this year for all the purposes for which the Export-Import Bank can function. They can do a general banking business, and I want to warn this House that unless we place some restriction on the charter of the Export-Import Bank they can, and they will, do an import business to the prejudice of the farmers and the laboring men of this Nation.

With respect to the Department of Agriculture, in the original act the figure was \$600,000,000. The committee cut that to \$400,000,000. I assume that the members of the Committee on Agriculture of this House, which has had this problem before them for years, know a little more about the needs of agriculture than the Banking and Currency Committee which has never had an agricultural bill before it in my recollection. [Applause.]

The Committee on Agriculture just last week refused to report out a bill providing for additional farm-tenant loans in the amount of \$350,000,000. Therefore, the amount made available in this bill can be safely reduced by at least this amount.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the majority leader, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I feel there is little use today to appeal to the gentlemen on my left, the Republicans. They seem to be rather solidly against even the consideration of this bill. So my remarks shall be addressed to my colleagues of my own party.

This bill, or a similar bill, was taken up in the Senate and debated for several days. Many amendments were adopted and on last evening the Senate passed the bill. The rule that is now before you is simply to make the consideration of this bill in order. It is an absolutely open rule. Any Member of the House, it matters not what his predilections may be, may offer any amendment to perfect the bill as he would like to see it perfected, and then if not perfected as he would like to have it, he may vote against the bill on final passage.

It seems to me we are asking little of our Democratic colleagues, and I say this, of course, without criticism and without any feeling except the kindest toward everyone on my side of the House; but it seems to me that when the President of the United States makes a recommendation to the Congress, when a committee after hearings and long consideration reports a bill, it is asking little of our colleagues on our own side of the House to make that bill in order and to consider it in the House of Representatives. [Applause.]

This, in my opinion, if the bill is passed in a reasonable form and if it is administered in a reasonable way, will be one of the most helpful recovery measures that has been attempted in the last 6 years. From the farm to the city, from the farm worker to the city worker, and from the farm to the small town and the large town businessman, I believe this bill will be helpful.

Something has been said here about rural electrification. When I think of all the bills it was my privilege and honor to be the author of, I am the proudest of having been the coauthor of a bill to bring the conveniences of electrification to the farm homes of this country. [Applause.] I also am proud of the fact that I had the privilege of voting for the Farm Tenancy Act, to bring the people of this country into home ownership, if possible. I am proud of the fact that I have voted for P. W. A. measures that have brought buildings to the countryside, the villages, the towns and the great cities and have made work from the mine and the forest clear up to the time when the building was completed.

Something has also been said here about a railroad loan. I hate to repeat it, but for 24 years I studied the railroad question. I have always been, as I am now, utterly and totally against Government ownership of railroads. I tremble for my country and its future when I contemplate Government ownership of railroads and adding a million or a million and a half more people to the civil rolls of this Government. We are going to have Government ownership of railroads unless something is done that will make them a little more prosperous and make it a little easier for them to operate. Not as many people of the country are for Government ownership of railroads now as there were a few years ago, but we will have Government ownership of railroads when, and only when, the railroad management comes down on Washington with their hands above their heads and say, "You must have the railroads to do the business of the country; we have carried them as long as we can."

I could stand here and touch every element of this bill, one that I believe will put people to work, put idle money to work, in an effort to make the business of the country prosperous again and to bring the country back to a more peaceable and a more peaceful condition, when labor may be employed, when capital may be active, and when every man's work on the farm, in the mine, in the factory, or in the counting house will mean something to him, because we all know that if this country is to live, to live as a great democracy, if it is to be a beacon light to free people throughout the nations of the earth, we must have peace at home among our own people, and we will not have the kind of peace for which we pray until men and women are given an opportunity to eat bread by the sweat of their brow, that capital may be able to work and that the people who own this country and who have helped to build it may have peace. [Applause.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 167, nays 193, answered "present" 3, not voting 65, as follows:

[Roll No. 151]

YEAS—167

Allen, La.	Coffee, Wash.	Ford, Thomas F.	Izac
Arnold	Cole, Md.	Fries	Jacobsen
Barden	Colmer	Fulmer	Jarman
Barry	Connery	Garrett	Johnson, Luther A.
Bates, Ky.	Cooper	Gathings	Johnson, Lyndon
Beam	Cox	Gavagan	Johnson, Okla.
Beckworth	Crosser	Gehrman	Jones, Tex.
Bloom	Cullen	Geyer, Calif.	Kee
Boland	D'Alesandro	Gibbs	Keller
Bradley, Pa.	Delaney	Gore	Kelly
Brooks	Demsey	Gossett	Kennedy, Md.
Brown, Ga.	DeRouen	Grant, Ala.	Kennedy, Michael
Bryson	Dickstein	Green	Keogh
Buck	Doughton	Gregory	Kerr
Byrne, N. Y.	Doxey	Griffith	Kirwan
Byron	Duncan	Hare	Kitchens
Cannon, Fla.	Dunn	Hart	Kocialkowski
Cannon, Mo.	Ellis	Havener	Kramer
Cartwright	Fay	Healey	Larrabee
Casey, Mass.	Ferguson	Hendricks	Lea
Celler	Flaherty	Hill	Leavy
Chandler	Flannagan	Hobbs	McAndrews
Claypool	Flannery	Hull	McArdle
Cochran	Folger	Hunter	McCormack

McGehee	Nelson	Robinson, Utah	Sutphin
McKeough	Nichols	Rogers, Okla.	Tenerowicz
McMillan, John L.	Norrell	Romjue	Terry
Maclejewski	O'Connor	Sabath	Thomas, Tex.
Mahon	O'Day	Sacks	Thomason
Maloney	O'Leary	Sasscer	Tolan
Mansfield	O'Toole	Schuetz	Vincent, Ky.
Marcantonio	Pace	Schulte	Vinson, Ga.
Martin, Colo.	Parsons	Schugham	Voorhis, Calif.
Martin, Ill.	Patrick	Shanley	Wallgren
Merritt	Fatton	Shannon	Walter
Mills, Ark.	Peterson, Fla.	Sirovich	Ward
Mills, La.	Peterson, Ga.	Smith, Conn.	Weaver
Monroney	Poage	Smith, Wash.	Whichel
Moser	Ramspeck	South	Williams, Mo.
Murdock, Ariz.	Randolph	Sparkman	Wood
Murdock, Utah	Rankin	Spence	Zimmerman
Myers	Rayburn	Steagall	

NAYS—193

Alexander	Dondero	Johnson, Ill.	Rodgers, Pa.
Allen, Ill.	Douglas	Johnson, Ind.	Rogers, Mass.
Allen, Pa.	Dowell	Johnson, W. Va.	Routzohn
Andersen, H. Carl	Durham	Kean	Rutherford
Anderson, Calif.	Dworshak	Keefe	Sandager
Anderson, Mo.	Eberhart	Kilday	Satterfield
Andersen, A. H.	Edmiston	Kinzer	Schafer, Wis.
Andrews	Elliot	Kleberg	Schiffler
Angell	Elston	Kunkel	Seccombe
Arends	Engel	Lambertson	Seger
Ashbrook	Englebright	Landis	Shafer, Mich.
Austin	Faddis	LeCompte	Simpson
Ball	Fenton	Lewis, Colo.	Smith, Maine
Barton	Ford, Leland M.	Lewis, Ohio	Smith, Ohio
Bates, Mass.	Ford, Miss.	Luce	Smith, Va.
Bell	Gamble	Ludlow	Smith, W. Va.
Bender	Gartner	McDowell	Springer
Blackney	Gearhart	McLaughlin	Starnes, Ala.
Bland	Gerlach	McLean	Sumner, Ill.
Boehne	Gifford	Mas	Taber
Bolles	Gilchrist	Mapes	Talle
Bradley, Mich.	Gillie	Marshall	Tarver
Brewster	Graham	Martin, Iowa	Taylor, Colo.
Brown, Ohio	Grant, Ind.	Martin, Mass.	Taylor, Tenn.
Burch	Gross	Mason	Thomas, N. J.
Burgin	Guy, Kans.	May	Thorkelson
Byrns, Tenn.	Gwynne	Michener	Tibbott
Carlson	Hall	Miller	Tinkham
Carter	Halleck	Monkiewicz	Treadway
Case, S. Dak.	Hancock	Mott	Van Zandt
Chapman	Harness	Mundt	Vorys, Ohio
Chiperfield	Harter, N. Y.	Murray	Vreeland
Church	Harter, Ohio	O'Brien	Wadsworth
Clark	Hartley	Oliver	Warren
Clason	Hawks	O'Neal	West
Clevenger	Heinke	Osmer	Wheat
Coffee, Nebr.	Hess	Pearson	White, Ohio
Cole, N. Y.	Hinshaw	Pierce, N. Y.	Whittington
Corbett	Jones, Ohio	Pierce, Oreg.	Wigglesworth
Costello	Hoffman	Pittenger	Williams, Del.
Courtney	Hope	Plumley	Winter
Crawford	Horton	Polk	Wolcott
Culkin	Houston	Reed, Ill.	Wolfenden, Pa.
Curtis	Jarrett	Rees, Kans.	Wolverton, N. J.
Darden	Jeffries	Rich	Woodrum, Va.
Darrow	Jenkins, Ohio	Richards	Youngdahl
Dirksen	Jenks, N. H.	Risk	
Disney	Jensen	Robertson	
Ditter	Johns	Robison, Ky.	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3

Buckler, Minn. Burdick Lemke

NOT VOTING—65

Barnes	Drewry	McMillan, Thos. S.	Sheppard
Bolton	Eaton, Calif.	Magnuson	Short
Boren	Eaton, N. J.	Massingale	Smith, Ill.
Boykin	Evans	Mitchell	Snyder
Buckley, N. Y.	Fernandez	Mouton	Somers, N. Y.
Bulwinkle	Fish	Norton	Stearns, N. H.
Caldwell	Fitzpatrick	Patman	Stefan
Ciuet	Harrington	Pfeifer	Sullivan
Collins	Hennings	Powers	Summers, Tex.
Cooley	Holmes	Rabaut	Sweeney
Creal	Hook	Reece, Tenn.	Thill
Crowe	Kennedy, Martin	Reed, N. Y.	Welch
Crowther	Knutson	Rockefeller	White, Idaho
Cummings	Lanham	Ryan	Woodruff, Mich.
Curlley	Lesinski	Schaefer, Ill.	
Dies	McGranery	Schwert	
Dingell	McLeod	Secrest	

So the resolution was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Buckler of Minnesota (for) with Mr. Knutson (against).
 Mr. Burdick (for) with Mr. Reed of New York (against).
 Mr. Lemke (for) with Mr. Bolton (against).
 Mr. Rabaut (for) with Mr. Thomas S. McMillan (against).
 Mr. McGranery (for) with Mr. Fish (against).
 Mr. Caldwell (for) with Mr. Stearns of New Hampshire (against).
 Mr. Dingell (for) with Mr. Reece of Tennessee (against).
 Mr. Hook (for) with Mr. Ciuet (against).
 Mr. Stefan (for) with Mr. Powers (against).
 Mr. Creal (for) with Mr. Eaton of New Jersey (against).

Mr. Magnuson (for) with Mr. McLeod (against).
 Mr. Sullivan (for) with Mr. Woodruff of Michigan (against).
 Mr. Somers of New York (for) with Mr. Rockefeller (against).
 Mr. Pfeiffer (for) with Mr. Thill (against).
 Mr. Schwert (for) with Mr. Crowther (against).
 Mr. Evans (for) with Mr. Eaton of California (against).

General pairs:

Mr. Lanham with Mr. Short.
 Mr. Martin J. Kennedy with Mr. Holmes.
 Mr. Drewry with Mr. Welch.
 Mr. Sweeney with Mr. Lesinski.
 Mr. Cooley with Mr. Secrest.
 Mr. Sumners of Texas with Mr. Mouton.
 Mr. Bulwinkle with Mr. Massingale.
 Mr. Hennings with Mr. Snyder.
 Mr. Schaefer of Illinois with Mr. Boren.
 Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Cummings.
 Mr. Boykin with Mr. Ryan.
 Mr. Crowe with Mr. White of Idaho.
 Mr. Fernandez with Mr. Barnes.
 Mr. Dies with Mr. Fitzpatrick.
 Mr. Collins with Mr. Smith of Illinois.
 Mr. Buckley of New York with Mr. Mitchell.
 Mrs. Norton with Mr. Harrington.
 Mr. Patman with Mr. Curley.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I voted "yea" on the resolution, as I intended to, but I am paired with the gentleman from New York, Mr. REED. Therefore, I withdraw my vote of "yea" and answer "present."

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, I had a pair with the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. BOLTON, who is ill. I voted "aye." I withdraw my vote of "aye" and answer "present."

Mr. BUCKLER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I voted "aye," and I find that I have a pair with the gentleman from Minnesota, Mr. KNOTSON. I withdraw my vote of "aye" and answer "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

On motion of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was rejected was laid on the table.

HOURS OF DUTY FOR FIREMEN IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA— VETO MESSAGE (H. DOC. NO. 464)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Clerk:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, H. R. 3314, Seventy-sixth Congress, "An act to provide shorter hours of duty for members of the fire department of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes."

The Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, in recommending disapproval of this act, invite attention to the fact that the act, if approved, will require the employment of 207 additional members of the fire department, costing approximately \$414,000 during the first year of operation and about \$20,000 a year for 5 years as longevity increase in salaries, making an ultimate additional annual cost of about \$500,000.

The Commissioners indicate that in the present financial condition of the District the cost of this act cannot be met without creating a revenue deficit. It is estimated by the Commissioners that the new District tax law, which was recently passed by Congress, will raise in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, about \$1,830,000 less in revenue than was raised under the District tax law theretofore in effect. This amount, however, will be reduced to approximately \$830,000 by the increase in the Federal payment to the District of Columbia in the fiscal year 1940. The result is that the revenue now made available to the District government is hardly sufficient to meet its usual and ordinary expenses and necessary capital improvements, without including the additional cost which would be imposed on the District by this act.

The Commissioners are of the opinion that, considering the actual hours of fire-fighting services as compared with the hours of duty of firemen in the District of Columbia, and considering the hours of duty required of firemen in the District as compared with the hours of duty of firemen in most of the larger cities throughout the country, no undue hardship will be suffered by local firemen in continuing the present hours of duty.

The Commissioners further state that under the provisions of the District of Columbia Appropriation Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, they are directed to cause a survey to be made for the purpose of determining what consolidations of present fire-department stations can be effected and as a result thereof what, if any, economies may be made in the cost of operating the fire department, and they believe that no change should be made in the present status of the fire department or its personnel until the completion of this survey.

The Commissioners state that they appreciate the services rendered by the firemen in the District of Columbia and regret that, for the reasons given, they feel it incumbent upon them at this time to recommend disapproval of this act.

I concur in the recommendation of the Board of Commissioners and am, therefore, withholding my approval of this act.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, August 1, 1939.

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the message and the accompanying bill be referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered printed.

The motion was agreed to.

SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—VETO MESSAGE (H. DOC. NO. 463)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Clerk:

To the House of Representatives:

I am returning herewith, without my approval, a bill (H. R. 6834) authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to settle claims and suits of the District of Columbia.

The bill proposes to confer on the Commissioners of the District of Columbia authority to settle claims in behalf of the District of Columbia. It is apparently the purpose of the legislation to render it possible to compromise small claims without recourse to litigation and thereby save the disproportionate expense which would be entailed by bringing suit in such instances.

The objective of the measure is clearly desirable. Unfortunately, however, its scope is far broader than the end in view, since no limitation on the size of the claim that would be subject to the proposed authority is included. Such a safeguard, in an appropriate amount, would seem to be requisite.

In view of these considerations, I am constrained to return the bill without my approval.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, August 1, 1939.

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the message and the accompanying bill be referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered printed.

The motion was agreed to.

ESTATE OF JOHN B. BRACK—VETO MESSAGE (H. DOC. NO. 462)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Clerk:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, H. R. 2480, an act for the relief of the estate of John B. Brack.

This bill provides—

That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the estate of John B. Brack (XC-489817), the sum of \$625. The payment of such sum shall be in full payment of all claims under the World War Adjusted Compensation

Act, as amended and supplemented, based on the service of the said John B. Brack, who is not survived by any dependent within the restricted classes of beneficiaries under such act.

Section 601 of the World War Adjusted Compensation Act provides:

(a) If the veteran has died before making application under section 302, or, if entitled to receive adjusted-service pay, has died after making application but before he has received payment under title IV, then the amount of his adjusted-service credit shall (as soon as practicable after receipt of an application in accordance with the provisions of section 604, but not before March 1, 1925) be paid to his dependents, in the following order of preference:

- (1) To the widow;
- (2) If no widow entitled to payment, then to the children, share and share alike;
- (3) If no widow or children entitled to payment, then to the mother;
- (4) If no widow, children, or mother entitled to payment, then to the father.

As the father died before completion of his claim and the veteran had no other dependents enumerated in section 601, there is no one entitled to the \$625 adjusted-service credit.

Section 603 of the World War Adjusted Compensation Act provides:

The payments authorized by section 601 shall be made in 10 equal quarterly installments, unless the total amount of the payment is less than \$50, in which case it shall be paid on the first installment date. No payments under the provisions of this title shall be made to the heirs or legal representatives of any dependents entitled thereto who die before receiving all the installment payments, but the remainder of such payments shall be made to the dependent or dependents in the next order of preference under section 601. All payments under this title shall be made by the Director.

This section was manifestly intended to restrict the payment of adjusted-service credit to the enumerated relatives and to prohibit payment of any benefits to the estates of deceased persons. It appears from the hearings and reports of the Congress prior to enactment of the Adjusted Compensation Act and subsequent amendments that payment of adjusted-service credit is intended for those dependents within the group and in the manner stated. The report of the House Committee on War Claims, to accompany H. R. 2480, states that "The deceased, John B. Brack, left surviving him four brothers and sisters who are next of kin, and who would be entitled to this adjudicated debt, namely, \$625, under the laws of North Carolina." The provisions of law recognizing certain dependents of World War veterans for death compensation purposes have never included brothers and sisters as such, the group never having extended beyond widows, children, and dependent parents.

Approval of the bill would have the effect of granting benefits to the estate of this veteran which are denied in other cases where the facts are similar. There are no circumstances present in this case which would warrant singling it out for preferential treatment to the discrimination of thousands of similar cases.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, August 1, 1939.

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the message and the accompanying bill be referred to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

The motion was agreed to.

MARKERS FOR CERTAIN GRAVES—VETO MESSAGE (H. DOC. NO. 461)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Clerk:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, House bill 985, an act to authorize the Secretary of War to furnish certain markers for certain graves.

Under existing law, headstones of durable stone, in designs approved by the Secretary of War, are furnished upon application for the graves of men honorably discharged from the Army, or who die in military service. The War Department furnishes these headstones, in American white marble, in

four designs, three of the upright type and one flat marker for use on graves in private cemeteries where vertical monumentation is prohibited.

This enactment would in no way affect the marking of graves in cemeteries under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of War. Its sole purpose is to enable the Secretary of War to furnish an acceptable marker for use in those private cemeteries in which the stone marker now authorized is not acceptable.

I recognize fully that new conceptions of cemetery design, landscaping, and monumentation have found widespread public approval in recent years, and that the marking of our military graves in the newer private cemeteries must conform to the general pattern of their surroundings. I object to H. R. 985, however, because it restricts to bronze the material which would be authorized for use in supplementing the present prescription of "durable stone." I would not object to legislation which would authorize the Secretary of War to furnish, upon application, for use on military graves in private cemeteries where the stone markers are not acceptable, monuments of such design and material as may be approved by him within present unit cost limits.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, August 1, 1939.

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the message and the accompanying bill be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered printed.

The motion was agreed to.

ALLOWANCES FOR UNIFORMS AND EQUIPMENT TO OFFICERS' RESERVE CORPS—VETO MESSAGE (H. DOC. NO. 460)

The Speaker laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Clerk:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, House bill 3321, an act to provide allowances for uniforms and equipment to certain officers of the Officers' Reserve Corps.

This bill would provide that officers of the Officers' Reserve Corps, eligible for active-duty training, shall be entitled for a period of 3 years after their original appointment and under such regulations as the War Department may prescribe to an allowance of \$50 per annum for the purchase of necessary uniforms and equipment.

The bill does not make performance of active-duty training a condition precedent to the payment of this allowance; thus every newly commissioned member of the Officers' Reserve Corps would be entitled to a maximum possible uniform allowance of \$150 merely by establishing eligibility for active-duty training, irrespective of whether he enters upon such duty, or whether, if ordered to active duty, the training is such as to require the wearing of the uniform.

I am not unmindful that the act of June 25, 1938 (Public, No. 732, 75th Cong., 3d sess.), provides a uniform allowance to commissioned and warrant officers of the Naval Reserve. However, active or training duty, with pay, at a location where uniforms are required to be worn, or the authorized performance of 14 drills, is a prerequisite to the payment of this allowance.

I would not object to legislation authorizing a uniform allowance to members of the Officers' Reserve Corps under original appointment upon completion, in separate fiscal years, of each of their first three periods of active-duty training, of 3 months or less, during which periods the uniform is required to be worn.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, August 1, 1939.

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the message and the accompanying bill be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered printed.

The motion was agreed to.

RED LAKE BAND OF CHIPPEWA INDIANS OF MINNESOTA—VETO MESSAGE (H. DOC. NO. 459)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Clerk:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith without my approval enrolled H. R. 3248, which would authorize a payment of \$15 to each member of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians of Minnesota.

The proposed payment would be made from a tribal fund derived from the sale of timber products which are manufactured at the tribal sawmill from stumpage cut on the Red Lake Reservation. The cost of operating the sawmill is defrayed from this fund. While I would have no objection to the distribution of any profits derived from this enterprise, I am informed that no part of the present balance in the operating fund represents an excess of operating income over operating cost. On the contrary, it appears that the mill is in debt to the Red Lake Tribe for stumpage in an amount which is far in excess of the difference between the balance in the tribal fund and the amount that will be required to operate the enterprise during the current fiscal year. In view of this and the fact that certain transportation problems have arisen recently which may result in a higher production cost, I believe that it would be unwise to deplete the mill fund at this time by the disbursement therefrom of some \$30,000 for per capita distribution among the Red Lake Indians.

Furthermore, there appears to be little justification at present for a per capita payment to these Indians from the standpoint of economic need. Many of them have an income from the fishing industry, while others are employed on C. C. C. work, on Indian Service road work, on W. P. A. projects, and in the timber and lumber operations on the reservation. In fact, employment opportunities exceed the requirements of the Indians, making it necessary to employ whites and Indians of other tribes to meet the demand for labor at the Red Lake Agency. I am informed that the needs of many of the unemployables are being met by the operation of the Social Security Act.

There is now under consideration a land-use program for the Red Lake Reservation which, if inaugurated, will require for its success the use of such tribal capital as may then be available. It is certain that the expenditure of the tribal funds for such a purpose will result in greater benefits to the members of the tribe than could possibly flow from a per capita distribution of tribal assets.

For the foregoing reasons I am compelled to withhold approval of the bill.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, August 1, 1939.

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal.

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the message and the accompanying bill be referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered printed.

The motion was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ACT OF 1921

Mr. DOXEY submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 4998) to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent Mr. VOORHIS of California and Mr. MAPES were granted permission to revise and extend their own remarks.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, an hour or so ago I received unanimous consent to extend my remarks to include a speech delivered in honor of the Goliad battle by Judge Davenport. The speech is of unusual length, and I inadvertently failed to state that I had submitted it to the Government Printing Office for an estimate of the cost. I did so, and I have a letter from the Printer, stating that it is estimated it will cost \$270.

I desire to ask unanimous consent to vacate the first request I made and renew the request now, notwithstanding the estimate of the Printer.

The SPEAKER. Without objection the request will be granted.

There was no objection.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include a short letter from the Chickasaw Indians of Oklahoma.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a resolution passed by the Missouri State Federation of Labor on May 24; also a resolution passed by the Central Labor Union of Kansas City.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CONSTRUCTION OF ADDITIONAL FACILITIES IN THE PANAMA CANAL ZONE

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 203.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 203

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 5129, a bill authorizing and providing for the construction of additional facilities on the Canal Zone for the purposes of more adequately providing for the defense of the Panama Canal and for increasing its capacity for the future needs of interoceanic shipping. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that this is a unanimous report of the committee, I am wondering whether the gentleman from Illinois desires any time on the rule.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Yes; we do. Just a few minutes; but we are not opposed to the bill.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, this rule makes in order the bill (H. R. 5129) authorizing and providing for the construction of additional facilities on the Canal Zone for the purposes of more adequately providing for the defense of the Panama Canal and for increasing its capacity for the future needs of interoceanic shipping.

The rule provides for 2 hours of general debate, and the bill will be considered under the 5-minute rule. I am informed that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries has reported this bill by a unanimous vote.

Mr. Speaker, the Army engineers have recommended additional locks in the Panama Canal because the battleships we are now building will be much larger than anything expected at the time the Panama Canal was built. At that time we believed that the width, as well as the length, of the locks was sufficient to take care of any ship that might be built. I had the honor and privilege of being at the Canal site when locks were being built. I was amazed then at the magnitude of these locks; and, therefore, it is surprising to me to realize how this country has advanced not only in the matter of the construction of battleships, but even in the construction of commercial vessels.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Does not the gentleman believe now that we were unwise in authorizing those three \$115,000,000 battleships? They are causing us now to go beyond the building of battleships to the point where we have to change everything we own in order to operate them.

Mr. SABATH. Not necessarily, because conditions forced us to do this. In addition to that, other vessels have been increased in size and traffic has increased until the point is reached requiring additional facilities at the Canal.

Mr. Speaker, when the request for the granting of a rule was up for hearing by the Rules Committee, being more or less familiar with the history of the Panama Canal, I questioned the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND], chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, whether a proper survey had been made and consideration given to existing conditions. While he assured me the bill had been recommended by the War Department engineers, notwithstanding that fact, I wrote a letter to the President questioning the wisdom of appropriating \$277,000,000 for additional locks, having in mind the slides in Culebra Cut which has cost millions and fearing recurrences, I felt that the proposed bypass would be too close to the Canal—being only a half to three-quarters of a mile from the Canal and both the old and new locks might be subject to attack at the same time. Therefore, I entertained the thought that a new canal should be constructed, perhaps in Nicaragua. I also raised the question as to the employment of alien labor and the wages to be paid. In answer to my communication I received a letter from the President in which he notes my suggestions and indicates his own opinion as to certain changes, to the extent of conveying to me the gist of some proposed correcting amendments, which I understand the chairman of the committee [Mr. BLAND] will offer to the bill at the proper time.

Mr. SCHULTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. SCHULTE. There has been a great deal of discussion about the work that has been done on the Panama Canal. I wonder if the gentleman can tell us whether in the event this bill is passed American citizens will be employed in the construction of these facilities?

Mr. SABATH. It is my hope that they will be, and I believe arrangements and agreements have been entered into by which that will be brought about. I am fully aware of the gentleman's interest in the cause of labor and know that he desires only Americans employed there who would be receiving a fair wage, and working only such reasonable hours as those the gentleman has advocated for many years.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If they employ only American citizens down there would that interfere in any way with the good-neighbor policy?

Mr. SABATH. I think not, because these countries, whether it be Panama, Colombia, or some other country, recognize that under the leadership of President Roosevelt the policy of this country is to be on good terms with and to aid all our neighbors to the very extreme; and we have demonstrated that. We enjoy the friendship and good will of these countries now as we never enjoyed them before, as shown by the continuous increase of our exports to these countries and the friendly relations that exist between our Republic and those of South and Central America.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to detain the House, for there is no controversy over this bill. We had a little contest a short while ago, by the way, Mr. Speaker; perhaps some of the Members may have forgotten about the vote that was taken a few minutes ago. I know this, however, Mr. Speaker, that the American people will not forget the vote that was taken. [Applause.] The American people will hold responsible not only the solid Republican minority but also some of the Democrats who were misled into acting and voting as Republicans. [Applause.] I thank you for your approval of what I have said and am indeed gratified that so many of you agree with me. I am only sorry that Democratic votes are being used in this House to try and destroy the work and program of our President and our Democratic Party.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. No; not for the moment.

Mr. Speaker, in view of what has taken place today, I feel that adjournment will be hastened, which I have suggested for some time, because I realize the membership of the House has not been in the frame of mind to give due consideration to important legislation. My opinion was amply confirmed just a few moments ago.

It seems to me that the Republican membership, under the whip and spur of their leader and pressure from above, feel that their united opposition to all proposed beneficial legislation will be helpful to them in the coming 1940 Presidential campaign. But I wish to assure them they are making the same mistake which they did in 1935. They are cutting off their noses to spite their faces. They are made to believe, by their leaders, because some Republican newspapers applaud their action, that they are following the sentiment of the country, but they are mistaken. I have been here many years and I have seen many Republicans as well as many Democrats come to grief because they underestimated the intelligence, sentiment, and feeling of the common people—the sentiment of their constituents. This applied, as I have stated, not only to Republicans, but to some Democrats whose names I would mention if I did not want to take up the time of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I regret to see so many Republicans and some Democrats digging their own political graves by voting as they did against the project lending bill and other beneficial and constructive bills recommended by the President so as to bring about greater reemployment and improved business conditions—all intended for the interest and welfare of our great country. Regardless of what the Wall Street-controlled press may say about the President, you and they know that he is brave and sincere in his efforts to improve the condition of the underprivileged and to provide better living conditions for them.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the fact that the votes of some of my Democratic colleagues are spite votes. I have observed nearly all the gentlemen from Virginia, West Virginia, Georgia, North Carolina, Texas, and a scattering from Ohio and Pennsylvania, cast their votes purely for political reasons against the lending bill. There were some who actually voted against the rule resolution because they did not have time to digest the benefits that would come to their constituency under the provisions of the bill. Personally, I regretted to see them take the erroneous position that they did, because I admire them and hold many of them in the highest esteem. I tried to prevail upon them not to err by explaining the benefits to be derived to all sections of the country upon the passage of the bill. My only regret is that I was not in position to familiarize the members with all the communications and appeals that came to me in the past few days in behalf of the lending bill. I have done my duty. The responsibility is not mine, and it will not be up to me to explain to their constituencies—that responsibility and impossible task will be theirs, when the hungry, the unemployed, and underprivileged visit them when they return to their homes after adjournment.

Mr. Speaker, I have digressed from speaking on the legislation now under consideration because I feel keenly the disappointment awaiting millions of people in the rural sections of our country in being deprived of the great aid and benefits that the lending legislation would have brought to them as well as to the people of my district and State and to the large centers in all sections of the country. It most surely would have created additional purchasing power which would have meant so much in bringing about reemployment.

Mr. Speaker, I return to speak to the rule making the Panama Canal locks bill in order, but I feel it is not necessary for me to take up any more time in further explaining the need of these additional locks, knowing that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND] the chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, will ably give you information on the provisions of the bill and will convince the House of the need of immediate action on the rule and bill.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the membership of the House for their courteous treatment. If I have

used any harsh words or expressions toward anyone it was because I have been so extremely interested in the enactment of legislation that would have accelerated the return of that prosperity to which the people of our great country are entitled. [Applause.]

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, this bill provides for the defense of the Panama Canal and the enlargement of the locks there to enable ships, which are now pressed for space, to go through. I do not believe any of us here have any objection to the bill. We want to make the Panama Canal Zone as invulnerable as possible. From the reports received we find an ever-increasing number of large ships going through the canal which are scraping on the sides. It is therefore extremely important, according to the reports that have come to the President, that these additional locks be provided.

Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of the committee to certain observations in this bill which I think are of vital importance.

On page 2, line 8 of the bill, there is the following language:

For the purposes aforesaid, the Governor of the Panama Canal is authorized to employ such persons as he may deem necessary.

According to the figures covering the Panama Canal Zone, the Government hires 13,000 employees, of which 10,000 are aliens. Their work consists chiefly of being timekeepers, watchmen, policemen, brakemen, and so forth. I wonder why this bill should come in permitting the Governor of the Panama Canal Zone to continue to hire aliens to do this type of work when there are 12,000,000 American citizens now walking the streets looking for work?

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Why cannot these employees be required to be American citizens, civil-service employees, if you please? I note the language exempts these new employees from the provisions of the Civil Service and Classification Acts.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I think the gentleman is correct. I would like to have the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries offer an amendment about as follows:

Provided, That none of the funds herein authorized may be used for the purpose of paying the salary or wages of any alien directly or through any contractor or subcontractor indirectly.

I do not know why the United States Treasury should be paying the salaries of an estimated 10,000 aliens from Jamaica.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman used the word "authorized." Does not the gentleman think there should be added also "and appropriated as a result of the authorization"?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I think the gentleman is correct.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. What is the estimate for making these contemplated changes in the locks, the various changes that will be made in the Panama Canal?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. The estimate of the cost, I may say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, is \$277,000,000. In the fiscal year 1940 not more than \$15,000,000 shall be appropriated.

Mr. RICH. If we had eliminated the \$115,000,000 battleships from our naval appropriations would it have been necessary to make the changes that it is contemplated to make if this bill passes?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I would say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the history of the past 20 years shows that we continually build larger ships. I believe it is safe to predict that the world will continue to build larger ships.

Mr. RICH. Does not the gentleman believe that if we build them any larger the world will sink pretty soon?

Mr. SANDAGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. SANDAGER. I may say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that it is not so much a question of building large ships as it is a question of having a bypass in case of sabotage, so that if a bomb or a shell or anything of that nature were exploded in the canal it would not block up the canal and you would have a bypass that would be operative. The question of size is important, but it is necessary to have a bypass.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. So I would say to the committee having this bill under consideration that I believe it is important that there be some stipulation made whereby the Governor of the Panama Canal Zone, whoever he may be, will not have the right as a dictator to go out and pick any foreign agents he wishes to employ there. It should be stipulated at least that the men doing this labor should be American citizens instead of foreigners.

Mr. BLAND. I may say to the gentleman that the determination of those policies is in the President of the United States under present law. Very serious questions of health, of cost, and of policies are involved, to such an extent that it would be practically impossible for me to concede such an amendment at this time. The President has entire control of the policies with respect to the employment of labor on the Panama Canal. I, for one, would be delighted to see the conditions such that American labor could be employed. I went down there and became convinced that if that condition ever is brought about it will be through a series of years. This situation will be brought out in debate on that question. The cost alone of constructing the additional facilities for the Panama Canal with all American labor would be increased \$81,000,000, and the cost of this project would be increased \$34,000,000 if all above the grade of laborer were Americans. If we were to put an item of that kind in this bill it would probably deter the use of the existing forces and very much impair the construction of the project.

May I say that if any Member wants to introduce a bill requiring all American labor or requiring that the number of alien laborers employed be reduced from year to year, if that bill comes before my committee I will give full hearings on it and let everybody be heard. It is a very, very broad question from an international point of view, from a humane point of view, and from a health point of view as to American citizens.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I appreciate the statement of the able chairman of the committee, but I still insist that with all these boys in the C. C. C. camps who are costing the Federal Government \$50,000,000 a month, I do not believe the climate of Panama would inconvenience them in any way.

Mr. BLAND. There is pending before the House today a bill that was reported by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and introduced at the request of the gentleman who is largely urging the employment of all American labor, predicated upon the fact that there is but a short period of life after these men work down there because of the unhealthy conditions. We have to a great extent conquered yellow fever and malaria, but the conditions of work of this kind require that the men go out into the jungle part of the Canal Zone.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. In view of the fact that there are 12,000,000 persons unemployed I still would like to have the chairman of the committee offer an amendment providing that the funds going out of the United States Treasury for this purpose be used for American labor instead of foreign labor.

Going further with this bill, it states that the Governor of the Panama Canal Zone may fix the compensation of the employees without regard to any other law affecting such compensation.

Mr. BLAND. I have an amendment that I believe will entirely take care of that situation. Certainly, it is satisfactory to the men of the Canal Zone.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I hope so, because under this bill the Governor of the Panama Canal Zone would be able to give anybody he chose \$20 or \$30 or \$50 an hour. Is not that true?

Mr. BLAND. I hardly believe that would be true, but at the same time I believe the gentleman will feel that the amendment we have prepared amply covers that.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I am glad to hear that, Mr. Chairman.

Another feature of this bill is that in line 11 of page 2 it gives the Governor of the Panama Canal Zone the right to authorize the making of any contracts, continuing or otherwise, in advance of actual appropriations.

Mr. BLAND. We have an amendment that I believe will amply cover that feature.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Would the gentleman care to state what the amendment is, because under this provision the Governor of the Panama Canal Zone, 3,000 miles away, without coming back here to Washington and without obtaining the approval of the President, the Secretary of War, or anyone else, could go ahead next year and enter into contracts in the amount of \$277,000,000 before the Committee on Appropriations would even have the matter before them. This would give the Governor the right to enter into contracts to bind the United States Government to the extent of \$277,000,000, without the Committee on Appropriations having anything to do with it whatever.

Mr. BLAND. The express language that was contained in the bill as it was originally reported would appear to bear out somewhat that contention. That was not intended by the author of this bill and consequently we have several amendments. One of the objections was that he could lower the rates in the Canal Zone. We have an amendment providing that the compensation of such persons shall not be lower than the compensation paid for the same or similar services to other employees on the Panama Canal. Then, provided further, that rates of compensation in excess of those authorized by law for other employees of the Panama Canal shall not be paid without the approval of the Secretary of War. This was to take care of special experts and persons of that type.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. That is with regard to pay. What about entering into these contracts?

Mr. BLAND. And provided further that the Governor of the Panama Canal, with the approval of the Secretary of War, is authorized to engage, under agreement when deemed necessary, expert assistants in the various arts and sciences upon terms and rates of compensation for services and incidental expenses, and to make contracts without the advertisement hereinafter prescribed, with respect to architectural or engineering services.

I am not reading all of the proposed amendment, but it also authorizes the making of any and all contracts necessary, and there was eliminated from the bill part of line 10, on page 2, and all of lines 11, 12, 13, 14, and 15. Eliminating those particular lines and substituting what I have here is said to cover that very situation because under general law there could be no appropriations without action by the Congress.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. In other words, I take it that the gentleman has amendments that will limit the wages that the Governor of the Panama Canal can pay employees?

Mr. BLAND. He is governed by the rules that apply there now. There was a complaint that he could lower wages.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. But the gentleman has changed that.

Mr. BLAND. Yes.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Now, in regard to contracts, under this bill he would be permitted to enter into contracts in the amount of \$277,000,000 without obtaining the approval of anybody back here in Washington, the Congress or the Secretary of War. Under your amendment will that be taken care of so that he will have to obtain the approval of someone back here before he can enter into contracts amounting to over one-quarter of a billion dollars?

Mr. BLAND. On page 2, line 9, after the word "authorized", insert the letter "(a)" and strike out the word "with" in line 10 and all of lines 11, 12, 13, 14, and 15.

These are the lines that I think the gentleman refers to when he says it gives broad power to make contracts without reference to the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. And also without the approval of the Secretary of War back here.

Mr. BLAND. Yes; I am told that takes care of it.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Then, Mr. Speaker, with the able chairman of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries bringing in these amendments, I do not believe there should be any objection by anyone in this Chamber, with the exception of that phase of it which I personally hope he will amend so as to provide that none of these funds shall be used except for American labor and providing also that there shall be a discontinuance of employment of all these aliens from Jamaica. Ten thousand aliens from Jamaica are now on the pay roll of the Federal Government in the Panama Canal Zone as compared with a total employment of 13,000, which I think is utterly unfair.

Mr. BLAND. The gentleman is mistaken about that, and I know he has not gone into the figures. The 10,000 include, first, 2,500 Panamanians which would reduce the number to 7,500. Many of these people who are employed there are people who were brought to the Panama Canal for the construction work on the Canal when it was impossible to get Americans. The question involved is a very broad one that we could not pass on by an amendment here. Many of these people were brought in there when the turn-over was so great that the work would not have been completed otherwise, and many Americans could not have stood the climate and the disease in that country. It was brought out this year before our committee that during this period of construction there were Americans who were stricken with yellow fever, typhoid, malaria, and other diseases. This testimony was brought out in connection with a bill which we reported and which has received a Presidential veto. One man there, an engineer or possibly a doctor, stated he would retire at night with four occupying beds adjoining him and the next morning three would be empty. These were the conditions that existed there at that time and these men were brought in and were taken from their homes in the other islands. They cannot be dismissed and made charges upon the Republic of Panama. They cannot be repatriated back home. Some of them have been born in the Canal Zone. These are broad, practical international questions that must be dealt with.

Then there is also testimony that our own men carried down there cannot stand what they call the white heat. As I said, we have conquered yellow fever and malaria, but the testimony introduced before the committee on another bill, by the gentleman who is sponsoring these amendments, shows that even the insurance companies have restrictions on these men working there. You have not the accommodations to take care of these men, if you were to impose all American labor in this Canal Zone, and you would increase the cost. You could not take care of them because you have not the accommodations on the Canal Zone. You must wait to provide them.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I merely submitted these observations, Mr. Speaker, in order that the membership should have the information before them.

Mr. BLAND. I would welcome any man in this House introducing a resolution to reduce from year to year the number of men employed there. I do not know, but I doubt that it could be made effective, but I would welcome it, because it will give an opportunity for every man to come before the committee and state his case and show whether it could be done. If it can be done, I would like to see it done.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Why would it not be well to provide that the Governor of the Panama Canal in the making of contracts should make them subject to the approval of the Secretary of War?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I understood that the gentleman from Virginia said that he had an amendment to that effect.

Mr. BLAND. This is practically subject to the approval of the Secretary of War.

Mr. McCORMACK. Why not put the language in there?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Did not the gentleman from Virginia tell me he had an amendment which would make these contracts in the Panama Canal Zone subject to the approval of the Secretary here in Washington, instead of some czar going in there and paying the wages he wants to pay them and at whatever rate he wishes? They should have the approval of somebody here in Washington.

Mr. BLAND. That is expressly in there, and as I understand the machinery of these contracts they must be approved by the Secretary of War. This man operates under the Secretary of War, and so far as labor is concerned, the President of the United States has entire control of the whole thing.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. According to this resolution the Governor of the Panama Canal Zone could employ anybody he wants to employ and he could fix the compensation at \$20 an hour if he wanted to, or he could enter into contracts binding the United States Treasury up to \$277,000,000.

Mr. BLAND. The general law prevents that. I am advised that the laws of the United States, unless special authority is given to him, would prevent any such contract as that, and for that reason we struck that language out of the bill which would have permitted it.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. What would the gentleman make out of this?

For the purpose aforesaid, the Governor of the Panama Canal is authorized to employ such persons as he may deem necessary and to fix their compensation without regard to any other law affecting such compensation.

Mr. BLAND. But that is stricken out.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Also—

To authorize the making of any contracts, continuing or otherwise, in advance of actual appropriations, aggregating not more than the total cost authorized herein.

Does it say anything there to the effect that the Governor of the Panama Canal, whoever he might be, has to come back and receive the approval of anyone here in Washington? I would like to see the gentleman from Virginia offer an amendment there providing that it would be necessary for this Governor of the Panama Canal to come back and receive the approval of the War Department before he can enter into those contracts to a total of \$277,000,000.

Mr. BLAND. If the gentleman will yield right there, the amendment provides:

And provided further, That the Governor of the Panama Canal, with the approval of the Secretary of War, is authorized to engage under agreement when deemed necessary expert assistants in the various arts.

(b) To authorize the making of contracts without advertisement.

And, generally, to make any and all contracts necessary for the prosecution of the work that is authorized. So that every part comes under the Secretary of War.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think the proposed amendment meets the objection, because it provides for the approval of the Secretary of War.

Mr. FADDIS. A bill that has passed the House and that has already passed the Senate, at the request of the Quartermaster General, makes it possible to enter into contract in the Panama Canal Zone, and I believe from my recollection of the bill it would also apply to this construction.

Mr. BLAND. I do not like to guess at things if I can help it.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under the amendment, which I have not seen, will it limit the Governor General of the Panama Canal so that the power is taken from him to fix the compensation at any rate he may see fit?

Is he limited in fixing hours and wages, or does it let him pay any salary or compensation that he so desires? Will the gentleman answer that?

Mr. BLAND. It shall not be lower than the compensation paid for the same or similar services to other employees.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I am not talking about lower; but how about higher?

Mr. BLAND. The rates of compensation in excess of those authorized by law for other employees of the Panama Canal shall not be paid without approval of the Secretary of War.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I think that satisfies me.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Is the gentleman in favor of the provision to leave these contracts without advertisement, which naturally means without competitive bidding?

Mr. BLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. BLAND. That is exactly similar to language that is contained in some of the other legislation, and only refers to special designs. Let me read it:

Authorize the making of any contracts—

And so forth—

without advertisement hereinafter specified with architectural or engineering corporations, firms, or individuals for the production and delivery of designs, plans, drawings, and specifications.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Why should we not have advertising and competitive bidding on those contracts?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. When General Goethals built the Panama Canal originally, the report showed it was impossible to enter into competitive bidding and get anything done down there.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Well, that was a long time ago. In view of the fact that this bill carries a potential appropriation of over \$277,000,000, and in view of the fact that the chairman of the committee admits that the bill as reported by the committee is ridiculous—that it is wide open and full of imperfections which have to be cured with a lengthy perfecting amendment which he is to offer and which is not in print and available to the Members—does not the gentleman believe that under orderly legislative procedure we should send this bill back to your committee so that you can give it a little consideration and bring it back to the floor in printed form so that the Members will know what they are voting on?

Mr. BLAND. Will the gentleman yield on that?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. BLAND. If the gentleman will permit me to answer that, I am not able to say what the gentleman shall determine is ridiculous or not, but when the gentleman says that amendments were not considered by the committee, each and every amendment which I propose to offer here was taken up in the committee and considered by us, and one of the amendments to which I have been referring just now was amended at the very able suggestion of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Well, where are the amendments which you propose to offer? Your committee reported this bill which you admit now has to be drastically amended in order to perfect it and make it workable.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I think all of us should appreciate the laudable motives and purposes behind this bill. With these perfecting amendments which will be offered, I think the bill should be passed without any question.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made earlier in the day, the remarks which I make now, and which I may make later on.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman asked to revise and extend his remarks and include certain things which I did not hear. Was it for the inclusion of other than his own remarks?

Mr. SABATH. Only the remarks I have made here on various rules and bills, and so on.

Mr. CHURCH. I withdraw my objection.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Reserving the right to object, the gentleman will not have an extension extending the lecture to his Democratic colleagues which he partially delivered on the floor, will he?

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, when attention was called by some of the gentlemen to the bill, and before the rule was granted, we had a conference with the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Mr. BLAND, and at that time he agreed to amendments, and the amendments met with the approval of all Members. However, before they were submitted, and when the question of labor was being raised, I wrote a letter to the President of the United States, being interested in helping the condition there, as well as here, and I read from the President's letter, dated June 19:

The Governor of the Panama Canal has given further consideration to the provisions of the bill concerning employment, and is recommending that the provisions to which you refer be deleted, and clarifying provisions inserted. The changes recommended are indicated in the attached copy of H. R. 5129, to which your attention is invited. These changes should obviate the criticism voiced in your letter.

In other words, I had criticized some of the provisions, and I was indeed gratified when the chairman of the committee agreed to these amendments, and I was further greatly pleased that the President himself has insisted that amendments should be adopted to clarify the sections that had been criticized.

Has the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] used all of his time?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Yes; we have concluded.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, earlier in the day I asked unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the establishment of the Bureau of Customs. I am informed it will take about three pages, and that requires special permission of the House. I ask unanimous consent that that permission be granted to me.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

VIRGIL KUEHL

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2346) for the relief of Virgil Kuehl, a minor, with a Senate amendment, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$3,500."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHAEL J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial on wages and hours in yesterday's New York World-Telegram.

LXXXIV—677

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after reading of the Journal and other special orders of the day, I may be allowed to address the House for 25 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks on the bill H. R. 7120.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ADDITIONAL FACILITIES FOR THE PANAMA CANAL

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, before moving to go into the Committee of the Whole, I would like to submit a unanimous-consent request that may save considerable time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (H. R. 5129) authorizing and providing for the construction of additional facilities on the Canal Zone for the purposes of more adequately providing for the defense of the Panama Canal and for increasing its capacity for the future needs of interoceanic shipping may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the improvement and enlargement of the capacity of the Panama Canal in the interests of defense and interoceanic commerce is hereby authorized to be prosecuted by the Governor of the Panama Canal under the supervision of the Secretary of War, substantially in accordance with the plans set forth and recommended in the report of the Governor of the Panama Canal, dated February 24, 1939, and published as House Document No. 210, and including such appurtenant structures, works, and facilities, and enlargements or improvements of existing channels, structures, works, and facilities as may be deemed necessary, at a total cost not to exceed \$277,000,000, which is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the purpose: *Provided*, That the initial appropriation for the fiscal year 1940 shall not exceed \$15,000,000. For the purposes aforesaid, the Governor of the Panama Canal is authorized to employ such persons as he may deem necessary and to fix their compensation without regard to any other law affecting such compensation, to authorize the making of any contracts, continuing or otherwise, in advance of actual appropriations, aggregating not more than the total cost authorized herein, as may be deemed necessary for the prosecution of the work herein authorized, to provide for the establishment and operation of such auxiliary plants and facilities in connection with the work as may be necessary or desirable, to utilize any of the facilities or services of the Panama Railroad Co. upon such terms and conditions as may be approved by the Secretary of War, and in general to do all things proper and necessary to insure the prompt and efficient completion of the work herein authorized.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. BLAND: Page 2, line 9, insert after the word "authorized", the letter "a" in parentheses, strike out the word "with" on line 10 and all of lines 11, 12, 13, 14, and 15, insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That the compensation of such persons shall not be lower than the compensation paid for the same or similar services to other employees of the Panama Canal: *Provided further*, That rates of compensation in excess of those authorized by law for other employees of the Panama Canal shall not be paid without the approval of the Secretary of War: *And provided further*, That the Governor of the Panama Canal, with the approval of the Secretary of War, is authorized to engage, under agreement, when deemed necessary, expert assistance in the various arts and sciences upon terms and rates of compensation for services and incidental expenses in excess of the maximum compensation provided by law for employees of the Panama Canal; (b) to authorize the making of contracts, without

the advertisement hereinafter prescribed, with architectural or engineering corporations, firms, or individuals for the production and delivery of designs, plans, drawings, and specifications; and (c) to authorize the making of any and all contracts necessary for the prosecution of the work herein authorized."

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, the first clause of this amendment prevents the Governor from reducing rates below rates paid other employees of the Panama Canal whose compensation is fixed under the Panama Canal Act at 25 percent above corresponding rates in the United States, a provision very much desired by the Canal employees' organization.

Provision for expert assistance is based on act of July 3, 1930 (46 Stat. 948, U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 33, sec. 569a).

This amendment which would take the place of the matter on lines 11 to 15 on page 2 is intended to accomplish the following purposes:

I have explained the first clause.

The second clause authorizes payment of compensation above classification rates and Canal rates only with the approval of the Secretary of War, who opposes the general provision authorizing the Governor to fix compensation in excess of rates now authorized by law.

The third clause follows the provision relating to the Engineer Corps of the Army (act of July 3, 1930, 46 Stat. 948, U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 33, sec. 569a) and authorizes the employment of engineering and other firms to prepare special designs and permits the employment for short periods of the highest type of consultant on special technical questions.

The last clause eliminates the objections that the Governor would have too much discretion to enter into contracts of large amounts without reference to appropriations, as worded contracts in excess of appropriations would have to be first approved by the Appropriations Committee.

These amendments, this one in particular, have been very largely explained in the colloquy that occurred between the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] and myself. I have no further comments, but in view of the fact the bill is being considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole I think that the gentleman from California [Mr. IZAC], and some others who especially desire to be heard, should be allowed to present their views.

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Speaker, I am very sorry that I have to oppose this bill, but I think you will agree with me when I tell you just what the true situation is down in the Canal Zone. This committee has undoubtedly been very fair in its hearings. They have arrived at a conclusion that I cannot agree with, but I believe they have done a good job and that in their opinion this is the solution of the problem in the Canal Zone.

When we started to build the Panama Canal they estimated the cost at \$182,000,000. When they turned it over officially in 1921 it had cost \$525,000,000, and that with the colored help from Jamaica. Since then 100,000,000 cubic yards of material have been taken out of the cuts, especially at Culebra, at a cost of another \$100,000,000, bringing the cost of the Panama Canal to date to \$625,000,000.

In 1931 the Board of Army Engineers made a complete survey of the situation along the Isthmus. They found that the proper place to give us better transit facilities for the United States fleet was at Nicaragua by the building of another canal there.

I am drawing your attention today to the fact that in this bill you are spending \$277,000,000 to build an additional set of locks within half a mile, average, of the present locks. This means that an attack made on the present facilities of the Panama Canal would subject the additional locks to

the same attack. On the other hand, by building another canal in Nicaragua from 500 to 700 miles from the present Canal we would make almost impossible the reducing of the fortifications in both places at the same time.

Mr. SIROVICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IZAC. I would rather not.

Mr. SIROVICH. Will not the gentleman yield just a minute?

Mr. IZAC. Yes; I yield.

Mr. SIROVICH. I call especial attention to the fact that the distinguished gentleman from California is making a very interesting contribution, but the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, of which I am a member, held hearings on the Nicaragua Canal plan. The results of those hearings show it would take from 10 to 15 years to build that canal and that the cost would be \$1,600,000,000. We are faced now with the necessity of protecting the Panama Canal. We cannot wait 10 or 15 years for the building of another canal.

Mr. IZAC. I will answer the gentleman in this way: The results of the survey made by the Board of Army Engineers is contained in this booklet. I am sorry that it is almost out of print, but the gentleman can still procure a copy of it. It is entitled, "The United States Government Inter-oceanic Canal Board," House Document No. 139, of the Seventy-second Congress, first session. Just read that and find out what the story is. It will cost \$722,000,000, including defenses, to build the Nicaragua Canal; but under the present bill you would be spending \$277,000,000 and still have all your eggs in the same basket.

Mr. SIROVICH. But that testimony as to cost is not the testimony of the Army engineers.

Mr. IZAC. I am very sorry, but this is the report of the Army engineers.

Mr. SIROVICH. What year was that?

Mr. IZAC. 1931.

Mr. SIROVICH. But in the 8 years that have intervened things have changed materially as to material costs and wages.

Mr. IZAC. Let me tell my friend this: They at that time suggested that the cost of building additional locks would be somewhere near what the estimate is now; and if the estimate of building the Nicaragua Canal has been increased to \$1,400,000,000 as the report says there is something funny about it. The whole story is simply this, the high command says we have got to find a way to get around this, we cannot object to a disparity of \$300,000,000 or \$400,000,000, we have got to show that it will cost a whole lot more. Hence their testimony this year doubling the cost of the proposed Nicaragua Canal as estimated by the Army engineers 7 years ago.

It will not cost \$1,400,000,000, because Colonel Sultan and his staff who went down there and made the survey have given the figures I am giving you now. We will say that it will take 10 years to build. Undoubtedly it will take 10 years to build. Do you suppose it is going to take less time to build these locks? It will take at least 6 years and probably 8 years. That is what you are going to gain in number of years, and that is all.

I want to show you something on these charts. Here is the Panama Canal. At the present time we are taking steps to guard the eastern approach. We are building a base at Puerto Rico in the 1,000-mile circle, which will completely dominate the Caribbean Sea. On the west side we have similar islands strategically located, and we could have the same type of defense against attack on the Canal. But what are we doing? We are not even taking over the Galapagos or Cocos Islands, which would give us a listening post or observation base for our planes to guard the western approach to the Canal. Does anyone think that simply protecting the eastern approach to the Canal is doing all that we should do?

Mr. Speaker, my idea is that if we are going to spend \$277,000,000 and forever forget any other canal, let us at least guard what we have down there.

I show you here a strategic map which will demonstrate how an attack by airplane carriers will be made against the Panama Canal. I show you this black sector, which is the position an enemy will assume under cover of darkness from which to launch planes for an attack on the Canal.

I am forgetting all about sabotage and things that might happen to the Canal in the meantime. Here we are with a situation like this, and we have no listening post out here where we should have one. We have not made arrangements to lease a place over here in Salvador, Guatemala, or Ecuador. This whole western approach to the Canal Zone is absolutely unprotected. Still they come in here and ask us to spend \$277,000,000 when we have not yet taken advantage of the natural defenses west of the Panama Canal up to this time.

Mr. Speaker, this is no secret so I can tell it here today. An attack launched, such as I have shown here, would permit at least 50 percent of the attacking planes to get through the antiaircraft barrage, drop bombs on the locks of the Panama Canal, and get back to their airplane carriers. Everybody knows that. It is no secret. Let us do something about that before we go ahead and spend \$277,000,000 to put all the eggs in the same basket.

Down here on this chart we show the Nicaragua Canal. I do not know whether that was the best place for the canal or not, but the Army engineers think so. They have a very fine report showing how feasible it would be. You can build that canal for \$700,000,000 with all of the defenses so the Army engineers say. Thirty batteries of antiaircraft guns are at Panama under the Army today. At least 27 batteries are there today and 3 more expected. They cannot keep out an attack such as I have outlined here.

Mr. TERRY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IZAC. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. TERRY. Is it contemplated that the Nicaragua Canal will be at sea level or through locks?

Mr. IZAC. There is no such thing as a sea-level canal. We would still have to have the tidal locks at any place along the Isthmus an interoceanic canal is built because of the difference in tides between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans. We must have some kind of locks to keep out the water. When they talk about a sea-level canal it does not mean that. If you would attempt to make the Panama Canal a sea-level canal, so-called, or a canal with only tidal locks, it would probably cost a billion and a half dollars, according to the Army engineers' figures, and consume a long period of time.

By the construction of another canal at a cost of three-quarters of a billion dollars we can have two transits for the fleets, if you please, in time of war. It is admitted by everyone that an attack launched against one canal would give us ample time and protection to take care of the other one.

Mr. SIROVICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IZAC. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SIROVICH. I distinctly asked the Army engineers myself, in view of the emergency that now exists, whether they preferred a canal through Mexico, Nicaragua, Chiriqui, or Panama, and they specifically said they wanted the Panama Canal because it can be finished within a few years, whereas a canal constructed across Nicaragua would take from 10 to 16 years and would cost \$1,600,000,000 to construct.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. IZAC]?

There was no objection.

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Speaker, it is true it would take a little longer, but not very much longer. We are going ahead and building these 45,000-ton battleships, but we are not going to have the canal ready or the locks ready at Panama by the time the battleships are finished anyway. Originally there was a big scrap here in Congress as to where the canal should be built. Panama won. There were lots of reasons. You probably know those reasons better than I do. Nevertheless, the proper place for the canal originally was Nicaragua.

Let me give you one reason above all others. The cut at Gaillard is 494 feet from the top of the slope down to the bottom. On the Nicaragua Canal route it would have been 344 feet, a difference of 150 feet in favor of the Nicaragua Canal.

Every time you cut 1 foot it means \$1,000,000, roughly. Still they insisted on going through that place, which was a tremendous cut as contrasted with the other. Not only that, but they had to make the cut at Gaillard 8¾ miles long. The cut through the east Divide at Nicaragua is 2¼ miles long, a difference of 6½ miles. Still, some people had influence enough to get the canal built at Panama. Now that we have it I would like to see it properly taken care of and properly guarded, of course, and that is why I appeal to the House, if we are going to spend another \$277,000,000 and put all our eggs in that same basket, let us do something to protect that life line of ours. We are not doing it. I defy anyone, Army or Navy, to claim that they are doing it or to assert for one moment that they are properly taking care of the defenses of the Panama Canal when they do not take over the only islands strategically placed on the west to guard that canal properly.

Mr. SANDAGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IZAC. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. SANDAGER. May I ask the gentleman if he believes it is going to be any easier to protect two canals than to protect one canal?

Mr. IZAC. It will cost much more money to protect two canals, undoubtedly, but the fact of the matter is that if you have two defenses and the enemy reduces one you still have the other one. It is an almost certain fact that an enemy would never appear in force sufficient to reduce both fortifications at the same time, since they are about 700 miles apart on the west, although I admit that on the east they are only about 400 miles apart; but even so, you have a difference there of 400 miles from one canal to the other.

What have you between the locks? The twin locks there now at Panama are separated by a wall. One bomb destroying that wall destroys both locks. You are going to put this third set of locks from one-quarter to three-quarters of a mile distant, and that is all. Have any of you ever been on a plane leveling off on a straight line to drop bombs, and seen that bomb hit within the space of a handkerchief? Why, if you land within a quarter of a mile or three-quarters of a mile you are doing pretty good, if the enemy keeps you up high enough, and that is what experience down there has shown. In other words, when you put these locks only a half mile away or three-quarters of a mile away they are still under the same fire as if they were within a few feet of the other locks. When you get 400 miles away or 700 miles away you really have some protection, at least from that same attack.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IZAC. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. TERRY. How much did the gentleman say the Nicaragua Canal would cost?

Mr. IZAC. Seven hundred and twenty-two million dollars, including defenses. This information is right in this little book written by the survey force. It was only 1931 when we sent the Army engineers down there, and this is the only real survey that has been made.

Mr. TERRY. Does the gentleman mean that would include the same type and quality of defense that is contemplated now for the Panama Canal?

Mr. IZAC. I cannot say as to that, because that would depend on the War Department. It would be up to the War Department to say how many batteries of antiaircraft guns, and how many 16-inch coast defense guns would be required.

Mr. TERRY. I thought the gentleman would know the cost, inasmuch as the gentleman said "including defenses."

Mr. IZAC. Those are the very words I took from the report, at the bottom of page 16, "including cost of defense." They will have to put defenses there, there is no question about it; but when those defenses are built it will make that canal practically impregnable. Certainly if they reduce that

canal you can still use the Panama Canal and vice versa. And the locks contemplated for Nicaragua are big enough to take any ship built or building or which we will build probably in the next 100 years. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STARNES of Alabama to the committee amendment: On page 1, line 3, after the word "Canal" strike out the colon and insert a comma and the following: "and all such persons occupying skilled, technical, clerical, administrative, and supervisory positions shall be citizens of the United States."

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is not germane to any part of the bill. The bill merely provides for the construction and does not deal with questions of labor. As I recall it, the amendment not only deals with this new portion but also with the original Panama Canal.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia makes the point of order that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES] is not germane to the committee amendment. From a very cursory and hurried reading of the committee amendment it appears that the first part of that proviso deals with the compensation of such persons; that is, persons who may be employed on the Canal. As the Chair reads the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama, it is a limitation upon the nature and character of such employees. The Chair is, therefore, of the opinion that the amendment is germane to the committee amendment, and overrules the point of order.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, it is estimated there will be 12,000 people employed under the provisions of this bill in the Canal Zone; of this number at least 3,000 will be within the category covered by the amendment, skilled workers, administrative workers, and men and women working in a supervisory capacity. My amendment merely seeks to limit that employment to American citizens.

I cannot conceive of anyone offering a valid objection to the employment of American citizens only in these capacities on such a vital link in our national defense system. The amendment is offered purely and solely for that purpose.

At the present time we have thousands of common laborers there who are British West Indians and British subjects. It is the policy of the War Department to employ American citizens in supervisory and skilled capacities and this amendment of mine merely seeks to write that policy into positive law, and as a declaration on the part of the Congress that we want American citizens and American citizens only employed in such capacities at this vital point in our national defense.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. STARNES of Alabama to the committee amendment: Insert "Provided, That all contracts herein authorized shall be made with American citizens or with American corporations and employment preference shall be given to American citizens."

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order against the amendment, first, that it is not a substitute. The pending amendment relates only to labor and the other amendment deals with contracts which is entirely a different proposition.

The SPEAKER. The Chair sustains the point of order. This is an amendment in the third degree which is not in order as a substitute to the Starnes amendment.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin makes the point of order there is not a quorum present. The Chair will count.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Starnes amendment.

Mr. Speaker, on the broad principle that is involved in the Starnes amendment there would appear, generally, to be no opposition, but when you come to a definition of what is skilled labor and similar conditions to be met in administration of the law, it would involve serious questions of administration and of policy so far reaching that I am not able to say just what the effect would be.

I made the statement some time ago in the course of this debate that the broad policy of labor is in the President of the United States. This is evidenced by the Executive orders that have been issued with respect to labor. First, I want to call attention to the fact that there has certainly been no effort on the part of the War Department to increase the employment of aliens. The record will show that the employment of American citizens has been uniform and constant while the employment of aliens has varied. The number of United States employees in 1916 was 3,542, and in 1937 it was 3,428. The number of aliens has varied from 32,549 in 1911 to the minimum in 1937, the last figure I have, of 10,449. As I have said, the President has the power to fix this, and there have been several Executive orders that have determined the aliens that should be employed. The first was issued on December 8, 1904, promulgated by President Theodore Roosevelt, providing that the requirements with respect to United States citizenship may be waived for applicants for positions on the Isthmus of Panama under such regulations as may be provided by the United States Civil Service.

Then there was another by Secretary of War Taft, dated February 8, 1908, that only American citizens should be employed in the higher-paid positions, except where Americans were not available for appointment. The order provided, however, that any foreigners who were then on the pay rolls would not be affected.

Then on December 23, 1908, there was an amendment, that permitted the employment of Panamanians as well as Americans in higher-paid positions.

Then on February 2, 1914, there was an Executive order, as amended, prescribing conditions of employment for the permanent force for the operation of the Canal, and containing a rule which provided that all employees who receive compensation at the rate of more than \$960 a year or 40 cents an hour, must be citizens of the United States or the Republic of Panama, and such citizens will be given preference for employment in all grades. That rule provided that aliens may not be employed in such grades unless (a) they have occupied similar positions during the construction of the Canal for 2 years or more, or (b) in case of emergency, in which latter case they must be replaced by citizens of the United States or the Republic of Panama as early as practicable.

In a later Executive order, dated September 14, 1927, the Governor of the Panama Canal was authorized to increase above the limit of \$960 per annum the pay of not to exceed 100 alien employees who by long and efficient service had become of greater value to the Canal organization than could be adequately compensated by the limit heretofore established.

By Executive order on August 7, 1929, the Governor was authorized to increase above the limit of \$960 per annum the pay of not to exceed 12 alien employees in the positions of steward, chef, baker, and head waiter in the employ of the Hotel Washington and the Hotel Tivoli, but a maximum list of \$1,500 per annum was placed on the pay in such excepted positions.

Aliens receiving compensation in excess of \$960 per annum number 245, all of whom have been employed in conformity with the provisions of the above orders. The great mass of the alien employees are receiving rates of pay ranging from \$22.50 to \$80 per month, with an average of \$55 per month. There are about 10,000 of these native workmen. The number fluctuates considerably, according to the labor

demands, particularly in such work as stevedoring, bunkering vessels with coal, repairs to vessels, building construction, and municipal work, in which there may be variations from day to day or according to weather conditions. One of the reasons for the employment of these native workmen which form the mass of the unskilled and semiskilled laborers in the Canal Zone is that there is a constant reserve of such labor in the cities of Panama and Colon. Thoroughly acclimated to the Tropics and paid at the general level of compensation for such labor in nearby countries. Today the President of the United States has the power to determine the employment of these people and to reduce the number of aliens employed. It is variable, and I appeal to you in dealing with an important question like the defense of America, not to write rigid provisions in the law, but to rely upon your efforts and the patriotism and the honesty of the President to take care of the situation.

Mr. SCHAFFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. I cannot yield in 5 minutes. Then, as I said awhile ago, you have to take into consideration the health conditions. Do you know that even with the United States Army, they are permitted to remain in the territory of Panama for only 2 years? Why? Because of the danger of insanity and other troubles.

Mr. SIROVICH. And typhoid.

Mr. BLAND. And typhoid, on account of the heat, and tropical causes which have made it necessary to bring back United States citizens every 2 years. You are imposing additional burdens upon the work of doing work that is for the national defense and must proceed at once. I am asking for additional facilities. The War Department is asking for additional facilities, and the President of the United States is asking for these additional facilities. We should have something there for protection if bombs come from the air. You will have locks there, according to the construction plan, which are going to be bomb proof, as nearly as it is possible to make them bomb proof. They will take care of the largest ship that may be provided for the United States Navy. They will be protected, as far as humanly possible, from sabotage. Let us work out the salutary purpose that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES] has in view by a resolution brought before the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, studied by that committee, and seeking to provide a general policy of law rather than by dealing with a condition which you cannot meet by legislation here at this time and in this hour. I promise the gentleman he will have a complete hearing. What are you going to do for your reservoir of American labor down there? It does not exist. I ask that the amendment be voted down.

Mr. SCHAFFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last two words. Should the pending Starnes amendment be defeated, I hope that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND] will accept my amendment, which I shall reoffer. As he stated, this is a question of national defense. My amendment provides that all contracts authorized shall be made with American citizens or American corporations and that employment preference shall be given to American citizens. Under my amendment, which is not as drastic and restrictive, insofar as employment is concerned, as the Starnes amendment, the agency which employs these thousands of additional people will have considerable leeway. I do not see why, with 12,000,000 American citizens unable to find jobs through no fault of their own, the Congress should hesitate in voting into the bill which carries a potential appropriation from the American Treasury of \$277,000,000, a provision to give some of the 12,000,000 unemployed American citizens an employment preference. My amendment will also insure that American business institutions will obtain the contracts which will be paid for by taxes collected from American taxpayers. This will furnish employment to many thousand Americans in our American business institutions. I sincerely hope that if the Starnes amendment is defeated, we will put the brand of "America first" in this \$277,000,000 national-defense meas-

ure by incorporating my amendment, with the vote of the distinguished chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND], for whom we all have the greatest admiration and affection. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DIRKSEN) there were—ayes 24, noes 29.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SCHAFFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the pending amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SCHAFFER of Wisconsin to the amendment offered by Mr. BLAND: At the end of the amendment offered by Mr. BLAND insert: "Provided, That all contracts herein authorized shall be made with American citizens, or with American corporations, and employment preference shall be given to American citizens."

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order against that amendment that I made against the Starnes amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is of opinion that the opinions expressed on the ruling in the Starnes amendment apply to this amendment and therefore overrules the point of order.

Mr. SCHAFFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, we have 12,000,000 people in America who are unable to find jobs, through no fault of their own. Our Federal taxpayers' Treasury is almost bankrupt. This bill provides for an eventual appropriation of \$277,000,000, which is to be produced by and collected from our American taxpayers. This is an American national-defense measure. It is fitting that we should employ Americans on the project, so far as possible, in view of the fact that about 12,000,000 of our people cannot get a job, through no fault of their own.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHAFFER of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Do I understand the gentleman's amendment provides that such equipment as may be used for the construction work and building the locks—

Mr. SCHAFFER of Wisconsin. Absolutely; \$277,000,000 will be expended on this project from our American taxpayers' Treasury.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What reason does the gentleman think anybody could give for not supporting an amendment of that kind?

Mr. SCHAFFER of Wisconsin. They cannot give any reason, unless they want to follow a friendly neighbor policy and raid the American taxpayers' Treasury of \$276,000,000 to furnish contracts and employment for non-Americans.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Who in Latin America could supply the equipment, if anyone, and if we do not buy it from the Latin American countries, then we will have to go to England or France or get it from Germany or Italy. We can produce all of this equipment in America. When we manufacture this equipment in America we will furnish jobs to Americans in many of our factories which are now working about 50 percent of their capacity.

I think the gentleman's amendment is very good.

Mr. SCHAFFER of Wisconsin. The gentleman is absolutely correct, and I appreciate his contribution and support of my amendment.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the statement of the distinguished chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee that he opposed the Starnes amendment because it was too restrictive and would interfere with the employment program, I respectfully call to his attention that my amendment is not as restrictive. My amendment, insofar as employment restrictions are concerned, only provides that preference shall be given to American citizens. Should American citizens, of whom there are now 12,000,000 who cannot find jobs, who must pay for this \$277,000,000 project, express their intention that they want to work on it, they should not be denied that opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, this is a \$277,000,000 American national-defense measure. The American taxpayers foot the bill. Americans should receive the contracts as well as employment on the project. [Applause.]

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I called attention a few moments ago to the conditions which prevailed in the Panama Canal, especially as to health. Remember you are dealing now with a reservoir of unskilled labor. There will be fluctuation. First, there is no habitation; no place for them to live. What will be done to take care of them in the time that they are doing this work? Many of the insurance companies, according to the testimony that appeared before the committee on another bill, do no business in the Panama Canal Zone. They consider the health risk too great. Those who do business there charge a higher assessment, in addition to the normal rate.

One gentleman interested in labor has been urging these amendments, and I call attention to the evidence which he introduced on another bill before the committee, coming from Surgeon General Patterson, of the United States Army:

Residence in the tropic regions at or near the sea level is unfavorable to the health of northern races. Among the things which may exercise deleterious effects may be cited, the temperature * * * the humidity * * * exposure to actinic rays * * * absence of normal sources of companionship and amusement, resulting in mental depressions * * * lack of exercise, and excessive indulgence in food, alcohol, and venery * * * association with natives * * * in my opinion nobody * * * no white man * * * lives in the Tropics over a long period who does not deteriorate in practically every way.

Now, you are dealing not with a normal condition on the Panama Canal, but you are dealing with an abnormal condition which will exist in the construction of new locks, additional locks, some half mile or more away, with no accommodations made to take care of them; no quarters provided for them; no way of segregation from the rest of the population, exposing them to disease, and without a reservoir on which you can draw if these men remain there only a short time. You may have the turn-over which you had in the original construction of the Panama Canal.

I have shown that the matter of this employment is in the broad power of the President of the United States. I am sure that with him and everyone else there will be every desire, as far as is possible, to use American labor, but that will be on the skilled and technical work; not on the unskilled work. You are subjecting your Americans to that which they and many of us here do not understand. I felt as many here do until I went to Panama in 1936 immediately after the jurisdiction of legislation of this kind was transferred to my committee.

Gentlemen, it is a subject that involves international relations with Panama itself. If we are going to finish these locks in about 6 years in order that they may be ready to accommodate the larger ships that go through, then we must have a reservoir of labor in Panama upon which we can draw and that we know will be certain, a reservoir of labor that is acclimated to the hardships of that climate, and not take a chance like this.

Further, Mr. Speaker, who knows, in the troubled conditions throughout the world, how soon we may need these locks. I hope there may be no trouble, but we wish to make the Panama Canal as safe as possible and as soon as possible. We cannot afford to delay. Just now, if a bomb were to fall in those locks of the present Panama Canal, the results might be serious. We must have these additional facilities, bomb-proof and safely guarded, as soon as they can be built, so that America need not spend the money that would be required to build up a navy for each ocean.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that this amendment be voted down.

Under authority granted to me to extend and revise my remarks, I wish to remind the House again that the President—not the Governor—has control of the situation. Existing law provides that all persons, other than the Governor of the Panama Canal, necessary for the care, management, maintenance, sanitation, government, operation, and protection of the Canal and Canal Zone, shall (a) be appointed

by the President or by his authority; (b) be removable at the pleasure of the President; (c) receive such compensation as shall be fixed by the President or by his authority until such time as Congress may by law regulate the same; and such persons shall be employed and shall serve under such conditions of employment, including matters relative to transportation, medical care, quarters, leave and the commutation thereof, and office hours and hours of labor, as have been or shall hereafter be prescribed by the President.

Surely the President of the United States has in his record shown himself to be worthy of this trust, and all may know that if a change should be made, he will make it.

Any change in the employment policies of the Panama Canal should not be made without full investigation, complete study, and careful analysis of possible results. They can be made at any time by Executive order of the President.

The Governor of the Panama Canal estimates that the cost might approximate \$81,000,000. The change in this way would have a most undesirable effect upon the permanent organization of the Panama Canal and upon the American workers themselves, and would result in an inevitable delay in the prosecution and completion of this most important defense project.

Careful preparation would be required to take care of such a large influx of United States citizens.

Governor Ridley has pointed out that these laborers must be seasoned and must be acclimated to the extreme rigors of the Tropics. He says that Americans cannot perform labor in the enervating climate of the Tropics, and it would be folly to provide by law that they must be used exclusively on this project. He says that he has not the slightest doubt that the result would be disastrous not only so far as concerns the carrying out of the project but as concerns the health and welfare of the workmen themselves. He says that our experience during the construction of the Canal, our quarter century of experience in its operations, and the experience of private contractors in large projects in tropical latitudes everywhere in the world conclusively prove that an attempt to utilize only American labor on the contemplated project would be doomed to failure in advance and would be a wholly inexcusable disregard of the costly lessons of experience.

It must be remembered that the existing facilities of the Canal Zone are sufficient only for those persons now actually engaged in the enterprise. There are no private housing facilities, and the schools, commissaries, and other utilities are adequate only for the regular organizations. While it would be relatively simple to provide construction quarters and other necessary facilities for the native workmen who would reside in the Canal Zone, problems of great magnitude would be involved in attempting to provide suitable facilities for many thousands of laborers and their families and would involve costly expenditures which would not be warranted on a comparatively short-time construction project.

There is pending on the Calendar of the House a bill introduced by me at the request of Mr. Hushing, the purpose of which is to amend the Canal Zone Code so as to provide more liberal retirement for American employees on the Panama Canal, because of the hardships, dangers to health, and effects of service in the Canal Zone. My committee reported that bill favorably. I wish any who may have any doubt as to the effect of service in Panama upon American citizens to read that report and the hearing held March 28, 1939, on the following bills: H. R. 141, a bill to amend the Canal Zone Code so as to provide for 30-year optional retirement; H. R. 142, a bill to amend the Canal Zone Code so as to provide for widows' annuities; and H. R. 1819, a bill to amend section 92, title 2, of the Canal Zone Code, and for other purposes.

Anyone who will read the hearings and particularly the testimony of Mr. W. C. Hushing, legislative representative of the American Federation of Labor, will not hesitate to vote down this amendment.

I urge that those desiring information on this subject read also the hearings held by my committee on March 21, 1939, on H. R. 980, H. R. 1674, and H. R. 3821.

I welcome a resolution for the study of these questions. If none is introduced, I will introduce one myself to that end, and before the Congress meets again I hope to visit Panama to consider the problems further.

Under the leave to extend and revise my remarks, I hope later to extend some remarks on this subject in the Appendix of the RECORD, so that all interested may have knowledge of the magnitude of the problems involved on which I have barely touched.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the committee divided, and there were—ayes 35, noes 38.

So the amendment was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I offer another committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLAND: Page 2, line 16, insert the letter "d" in parentheses before the first word in said line; page 2, line 18, insert after the word "desirable" in said line a semicolon followed by the letter "e" in parentheses; and same page, line 21, insert a semicolon after the word "War" and insert the letter "f" in parentheses after the word "and" in said line.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLAND: Page 2, after line 23, insert as a new paragraph the following:

"Notwithstanding any other provision of law, and except as otherwise provided in this act, all purchases and contracts for supplies or for services, except for personal services, shall be made by the Panama Canal after advertising, in such manner and at such times, sufficiently in advance of opening of bids, as the Governor or his duly authorized representative in the United States shall determine to be adequate to insure notice and opportunity for competition. Such advertisement shall not be required, however, when (a) an emergency requires immediate delivery of the supplies or performance of the services; or (b) repair parts, accessories, supplemental equipment, or services are required for supplies or services previously furnished or contracted for; or (c) the aggregate amount involved in any purchase of supplies or procurement of services does not exceed \$500; in which cases such purchases of supplies or procurement of services may be made in the open market in the manner common among businessmen. In comparing bids and in making awards the Governor or his duly authorized representative in the United States may consider such factors as relative quality and adaptability of supplies or services, the bidder's financial responsibility, skill, experience, record of integrity in dealing, and ability to furnish repairs and maintenance services, the time of delivery or performance offered, and whether the bidder has complied with the specifications."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman from Wisconsin opposed to the bill?

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Most definitely, in its present shape.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin moves to recommit the bill to the committee with instructions to report the bill back forthwith with the following amendment: "Provided, That all contracts herein authorized shall be made with American citizens or with American corporations, and employment preference shall be given to American citizens."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question will be ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin) there were—ayes 37, noes 43.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 144, nays 166, not voting 118, as follows:

[Roll No. 152]

YEAS—144

Alexander	Ford, Leland M.	Johnson, Ill.	Robison, Ky.
Andersen, H. Carl	Fulmer	Johnson, Ind.	Rodgers, Pa.
Anderson, Calif.	Gamble	Johnson, Luther A.	Rogers, Mass.
Andresen, A. H.	Gartner	Jones, Ohio	Routzohn
Angell	Gearhart	Kean	Rutherford
Arends	Gehrmann	Kinzer	Sandager
Austin	Gerlach	Knutson	Schafer, Wis.
Barton	Gifford	Kunkel	Secombe
Bates, Mass.	Gilchrist	Lambertson	Seger
Bender	Gille	Landis	Shafer, Mich.
Blackney	Graham	LeCompte	Simpson
Bradley, Mich.	Grant, Ind.	Lemke	Smith, Maine
Brewster	Guyer, Kans.	Lewis, Colo.	Smith, Ohio
Brown, Ohio	Gwynne	Lewis, Ohio	Sparkman
Buckler, Minn.	Hall	McDowell	Springer
Carlson	Halleck	Maas	Starnes, Ala.
Carter	Hancock	Marshall	Sumner, Ill.
Case, S. Dak.	Harness	Martin, Iowa	Taber
Chilperfield	Harter, N. Y.	Martin, Mass.	Talle
Church	Hawks	Mason	Taylor, Tenn.
Clason	Heinke	Michener	Tenerowicz
Clevenger	Hess	Miller	Thomas, N. J.
Cole, N. Y.	Hill	Monkiewicz	Thorkelson
Corbett	Hinshaw	Mott	Tibbott
Crawford	Hoffman	Mundt	Tinkham
Curtis	Hope	Murdock, Utah	Treadway
Darrow	Horton	Murray	Van Zandt
Dirksen	Houston	O'Brien	Vorys, Ohio
Ditter	Hull	Pace	Vreeland
Dondero	Izac	Pierce, N. Y.	Walter
Douglas	Jarrett	Pittenger	Wheat
Dowell	Jeffries	Poage	Wigglesworth
Dworshak	Jenkins, Ohio	Rankin	Williams, Del.
Elston	Jenks, N. H.	Reed, Ill.	Winter
Engel	Jensen	Rees, Kans.	Wolcott
Fenton	Johns	Risk	Youngdahl

NAYS—166

Allen, La.	Cullen	Keller	Patrick
Allen, Pa.	D'Alesandro	Kelly	Patton
Arnold	Darden	Kennedy, Md.	Pearson
Ashbrook	Delaney	Kennedy, Michael	Peterson, Fla.
Ball	Dickstein	Keogh	Peterson, Ga.
Barden	Disney	Kerr	Plumley
Barry	Doxey	Kilday	Polk
Bates, Ky.	Durham	Kirwan	Ramspeck
Beckworth	Eberharter	Kitchens	Rayburn
Bland	Ellis	Kocalkowski	Robertson
Bloom	Evans	Larrabee	Robinson, Utah
Boland	Faddis	Luce	Romjue
Boykin	Fay	McAndrews	Sabath
Bradley, Pa.	Ferguson	McArdie	Sacks
Brooks	Flaherty	McCormack	Satterfield
Brown, Ga.	Flannagan	McGehee	Schuetz
Bryson	Flannery	McKeough	Scrugham
Buck	Fries	McLaughlin	Shanley
Burch	Gathings	McMillan, John L.	Shannon
Burgin	Gavagan	Mahon	Sheppard
Byrne, N. Y.	Geyer, Calif.	Mansfield	Sirovich
Byrns, Tenn.	Gibbs	Mapes	Smith, Conn.
Byron	Gore	Marcantonio	Smith, Va.
Cannon, Fla.	Gossett	Martin, Colo.	Smith, W. Va.
Cannon, Mo.	Grant, Ala.	Martin, Ill.	South
Cartwright	Gregory	May	Spence
Casey, Mass.	Griffith	Merritt	Terry
Celler	Hare	Mills, Ark.	Thomas, Tex.
Chapman	Hart	Mills, La.	Thomason
Clark	Harter, Ohio	Monroney	Tolan
Claypool	Havener	Moser	Vincent, Ky.
Cochran	Healey	Mouton	Vinson, Ga.
Coffee, Nebr.	Hendricks	Murdock, Ariz.	Ward
Coffee, Wash.	Hobbs	Myers	Warren
Cole, Md.	Hunter	Nichols	Weaver
Colmer	Jacobsen	Norrell	West
Connelly	Jarman	O'Connor	Whelchel
Cooper	Johnson, Lyndon	O'Day	Whittington
Costello	Johnson, Okla.	O'Leary	Williams, Mo.
Cox	Johnson, W. Va.	Oliver	Zimmerman
Crosser	Jones, Tex.	O'Neal	
Culkin	Keefe	Parsons	

NOT VOTING—118

Allen, Ill.	Duncan	McGranery	Schwert
Anderson, Mo.	Dunn	McLean	Secrest
Andrews	Eaton, Calif.	McLeod	Short
Barnes	Eaton, N. J.	McMillan, Thos. S.	Smith, Ill.
Beam	Edmiston	Maciejewski	Smith, Wash.
Bell	Elliott	Magnuson	Snyder
Boehne	Englebright	Maloney	Somers, N. Y.
Bolles	Fernandez	Massingale	Steagall
Bolton	Fish	Mitchell	Stearns, N. H.
Boren	Fitzpatrick	Nelson	Stefan
Buckley, N. Y.	Folger	Norton	Sullivan
Bulwinkle	Ford, Miss.	Osmer	Summers, Tex.
Burdick	Ford, Thomas F.	O'Toole	Sutphin
Caldwell	Garrett	Patman	Sweeney
Chandler	Green	Pfeifer	Tarver
Cluett	Gross	Pierce, Oreg.	Taylor, Colo.
Collins	Harrington	Powers	Thill
Cooley	Hartley	Rabaut	Voorhis, Calif.
Courtney	Hennings	Randolph	Wadsworth
Creal	Holmes	Reece, Tenn.	Wallgren
Crowe	Hook	Reed, N. Y.	Welch
Crowther	Kee	Rich	White, Idaho
Cummings	Kennedy, Martin	Richards	White, Ohio
Curley	Kleberg	Rockefeller	Wolfenden, Pa.
Dempsey	Kramer	Rogers, Okla.	Wolverton, N. J.
DeRouen	Lanham	Ryan	Wood
Dies	Lea	Sasser	Woodruff, Mich.
Dingell	Leavy	Schaefer, Ill.	Woodrum, Va.
Doughton	Lesinski	Schiffler	
Drewry	Ludlow	Schulte	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:
General pairs:

Mr. Nelson with Mr. Osmer.
Mr. Lea with Mr. Bolles.
Mr. Garrett with Mr. Schiffler.
Mr. DeRouen with Mr. Englebright.
Mr. Bell with Mr. White of Ohio.
Mr. Taylor of Colorado with Mr. Gross.
Mr. Wallgren with Mr. Sweeney.
Mr. Lesinski with Mr. Wood.
Mr. Cooley with Mr. Secrest.
Mr. Summers of Texas with Mr. Elliott.
Mr. Bulwinkle with Mr. Massingale.
Mr. Hennings with Mr. Snyder.
Mr. Schaefer of Illinois with Mr. Boren.
Mr. Green with Mr. Cummings.
Mr. Folger with Mr. Ryan.
Mr. Crowe with Mr. White of Idaho.
Mr. Fernandez with Mr. Barnes.
Mr. Dies with Mr. Fitzpatrick.
Mr. Collins with Mr. Smith of Illinois.
Mr. Buckley of New York with Mr. Mitchell.
Mrs. Norton with Mr. Harrington.
Mr. Patman with Mr. Curley.
Mr. Rabaut with Mr. Kee.
Mr. Thomas S. McMillan with Mr. Sasser.
Mr. Edmiston with Mr. Leavy.
Mr. Ludlow with Mr. O'Toole.
Mr. Sutphin with Mr. Duncan.
Mr. McGrannery with Mr. Fish.
Mr. Caldwell with Mr. Stearns of New Hampshire.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.
Mr. Hook with Mr. Cluett.
Mr. Creal with Mr. Eaton of New Jersey.
Mr. Magnuson with Mr. McLeod.
Mr. Sullivan with Mr. Woodruff of Michigan.
Mr. Somers of New York with Mr. Rockefeller.
Mr. Lanham with Mr. Short.
Mr. Woodrum of Virginia with Mr. Powers.
Mr. Pfeifer with Mr. Thill.
Mr. Steagall with Mr. Eaton of California.
Mr. Beam with Mr. Stefan.
Mr. Doughton with Mr. Reed of New York.
Mr. Schwert with Mr. Crowther.
Mr. Ford of Mississippi with Mr. Burdick.
Mr. Martin J. Kennedy with Mr. Holmes.
Mr. Kleberg with Mr. Bolton.
Mr. Tarver with Mr. Wolfenden of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Drewry with Mr. Welch.
Mr. Boehne with Mr. McLean.
Mr. Dempsey with Mr. Wadsworth.
Mr. Kramer with Mr. Allen of Illinois.
Mr. Maloney with Mr. Hartley.
Mr. Randolph with Mr. Wolverton of New Jersey.
Mr. Richards with Mr. Rich.
Mr. Chandler with Mr. Andrews.
Mr. Smith of Washington with Mr. Anderson of Missouri.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a

bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2903. An act to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 7411. An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes.

RESIGNATION FROM CONFERENCE COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following announcement.

July 31, 1939.

Hon. WILLIAM B. BANKHEAD,
Speaker, of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: As I will be out of the city the balance of the session I ask to be relieved from further duties in connection with the conference on the social-security bill.

With assurances of my highest personal regards, I beg to remain,
Yours very sincerely,

HAROLD KNUTSON.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints on the committee in the place of Mr. KNUTSON the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

The Clerk will notify the Senate of the action of the Chair.

NADINE SANDERS

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I submit a conference report and statement on the bill (S. 1164) for the relief of Nadine Sanders, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

Mr. COCHRAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, under the rule the conference report should be printed. Why is not the ordinary course followed in this instance, the conference report printed in the RECORD, so that tomorrow morning we can all see what it is?

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland. I will explain it.

Mr. COCHRAN. Under the rules it should be printed. I think the conference report should be printed.

Mr. Speaker, I object.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the RECORD a statement of mine on the tin investigation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM]?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. MOUTON. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained from the House on official business at the time roll call 151 was held. Had I been present I would have voted in the affirmative.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GATHINGS asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

CONSTRUCTION, REPAIR, AND PRESERVATION OF CERTAIN PUBLIC WORKS ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 7411) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and agree to the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, after line 10, insert "Wood Island Harbor, and the pool at Biddeford Pool, Maine."

Page 11, after line 14, insert:

"Cleveland Harbor, Ohio: The existing project set forth in House Document No. 84, Seventy-fourth Congress, and authorized by Public Law No. 392, Seventy-fifth Congress, is hereby modified to provide that cuts or partial cuts may be made before the related railroad bridges are modified or rebuilt when in the opinion of the Chief of Engineers such procedure will be advantageous to navigation."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MANSFIELD]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to incorporate an address by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a statement of W. J. Crum, professor of economics and consulting expert of the United States Treasury.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. THORKELSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD with reference to the memorial service in honor of John Ericsson held in Washington, and to insert speeches made by my colleagues, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MAAS] and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SMITH].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ALEXANDER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include certain data on reciprocal trade.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the lending bill and to include brief excerpts from testimony presented in the committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a list of newspapers that endorsed pending legislation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a brief letter from a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. FAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in reference to my recent vote on the W. P. A. bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FAY]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under a special order of the House heretofore entered, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HILL] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, the first session of the Seventy-sixth Congress is about to adjourn. Like the seven preceding sessions which I have had the honor and privilege of attending, some desirable and beneficial legislation has

been enacted. But the forces of reaction are more firmly than ever entrenched in the Halls of Congress, opposing and preventing even consideration of progressive and necessary measures.

During the first term of the present administration it was the Supreme Court which, by its failure or refusal to interpret and apply the Constitution in the light of modern conditions and demands, prevented reform and thus delayed permanent recovery. I have long contended that the Federal courts have usurped the functions of a coordinate branch of the Government, the legislative. Neither is there time nor is it necessary at the present moment to give facts to prove that the Constitution clearly authorizes the Congress to make laws and delegates the power to try cases under those laws to the Federal courts but certainly never intended those courts to declare them unconstitutional and tear them up. The pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for 1933, 1934, and 1935 are replete with arguments for and against the proposition.

As far back as 1920 I predicted that some day a progressive President would appoint progressive members of the Supreme Court, and then we would hear the criticisms and bemoanings of the conservative elements of our country. The President in 1937 failed in his attempt to "unpack" a conservative court by the same constitutional method used by the second Republican President in our history, Ulysses S. Grant. But some of the Justices completely reversed themselves on minimum wages for women, the interstate-commerce clause, and other vital issues, and other conservative Justices resigned, making room for the appointment of men with forward-looking ideas and ideals. We now have a progressive Supreme Court, and the inevitable has happened. A Mr. Hogan of Doheny and Secretary Fall oil scandal fame has publicly denounced the august Supreme Court of the United States. And why, pray? Because, forsooth, it does not now interpret the Constitution so as to favor his special interests.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point a news item from the United Press of July 10, with reference to the statement of Mr. Hogan.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

COURT MAKES LAW, BAR HEAD DECLARES

SAN FRANCISCO, July 10.—The Supreme Court no longer preserves constitutional liberties, Frank J. Hogan, president of the American Bar Association, said today in opening the association's sixty-second annual convention.

He said the present Court has reversed constitutional doctrines and "established" principles and, therefore, the legislative branch of government would have to protect the people against "arbitrary exercise of power."

He praised Justices James Clark McReynolds and Pierce Butler for "courageous efforts to preserve landmark after landmark of the law," and to stop "the procession of precedents to the graveyard."

Mr. Hogan said there had been a curtailment of States' rights through the Court's interpretation of the interstate-commerce clause of the Constitution. Continuing, he said:

"It is to this expansion of the power of the General Government over practically every branch of human industry that I direct attention in the hope that my feeble voice may contribute to its recognition by the people whose liberties are involved in the exercise of such power."

CONFUSES LAWYERS

In its last two terms the Court affirmed 135 cases and reversed 175. There were 199 dissenting opinions. "These figures indicate the extent to which the reconstructed Court has undertaken to disavow and discard old doctrines and to declare new principles and new concepts," he said.

"The plain result of all this is that no lawyer can safely advise his client what the law is; no businessman, no farmer, can know whether or not he is breaking the law, for if he follows established principles he is likely to be doing exactly that.

"What was a constitutional principle yesterday may be a discarded doctrine tomorrow, and this, all this, is what has been so often proudly proclaimed to be a government of laws and not of men."

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the fact that the Court is now giving decisions favoring my point of view, I still insist that it is usurping the functions of another

constitutional branch of the Federal Government and agree with the gentleman from Washington, D. C., that Congress should reassume its power and authority to make the laws the same as the Parliament of Great Britain and the House of Deputies in France. Then we can let the people, the real sovereigns in this Republic, take care of the Members of the House and Senate at the next election. That is democracy. I have never had any fear of the common people, even when they have temporarily disagreed with my viewpoint.

During this second term of the present administration, with the Supreme Court more or less in accord with its policies, a coalition of conservative Republicans and Democrats have dominated the scene and obstructed or retarded progressive legislation. Witness the delay in enacting the wages-and-hours law. Despite the cry for harmony, I, for one, will not shut my eyes to the stark and naked truth that reactionary Democrats have all through this present session joined hands with the Republicans in either preventing New Deal policies and legislation from coming up for consideration or defeating it if forced to the floor of the House. All for the purpose of discrediting the present administration. Some of us have voted against the President on occasion, at times when it was very unpopular to do so, as, for instance, the so-called economy bill of March 1933 and the neutrality bill of recent date. But we have conscientiously done so as a matter of principle, a reasonable difference of opinion and judgment. But too many so-called Democrats have, and are, sabotaging the whole New Deal program and policies from personal hatred and bitterness toward the present occupant of the White House. This is neither statesmanlike nor commendable.

I reiterate what I have stated time and again on the floor of this House. Let the conservative Democrats and Republicans, honest as they may be in their convictions, join hands and form their party. Then let us liberal Democrats, Republicans, and Progressives unite in an opposition party and let us fight it out openly and frankly and let the people of the United States decide what they want. [Applause.] To most candid observers it would seem best that the former retain the name "Republican" and the latter retain the name "Democrat." This would be fair to the voters of this country; it would be fair to us who serve. In my humble opinion, it would be tragic for us to win in 1940 with the conservative Democratic tail wagging the liberal Democratic dog. We would be in the same impotent impasse that we are in at the present time. We spend a whole day discussing the acceptance of a Roosevelt library when it could be more profitably spent in discussing a cost-of-production bill for agriculture, which must be enacted before that large group can ever have the purchasing power it deserves. We spend 2 days debating antialien bills, which have the label of patriotism but contain the essence of the old alien and sedition laws of the Whig days.

I voted against the Smith bill and have no apologies to offer. A careful reading of the bill will show that it selects certain dangerous groups for deportation and refusal of entry, and excepts others just as dangerous to our form of government. An amendment by the gentleman from Colorado, Congressman JOHN MARTIN, to add the names "Communist, Nazi, and Fascist" after the word "anarchists" as subject to refusal of entry to this country was strongly opposed by the proponents of the Smith bill and decisively defeated by the majority which enacted the law. I despise and denounce all three of these subversive forms of government and am skeptical of that patriotism which distinguishes between them.

There is reason to believe there are members of the Silver Shirts right here on the floor of the House—at least those who sympathize with them. If there is anyone here who would rather wear a red shirt, or a silver shirt, or a black shirt, than a khaki shirt, let him go to Russia, Germany, or Italy and sit at the feet of Stalin, Hitler, or Mussolini. If there is anyone within the sound of my voice who would rather salute the hammer and sickle, the swastika, or the fasces and ax than make obeisance to Old Glory, he is not fit to be a citizen of

the United States, much less a Member of this House of Representatives. Some of you want to fingerprint the aliens. That is a very laudable proposition. But may I respectfully suggest that you propose a law or a rule of this body that every Member declare that he is neither a member of nor in sympathy with communism, fascism, or nazi-ism. Let us begin by fingerprinting the membership of this House. I quote, "The honest men will not object; the dishonest ones should be forced to submit."

As I observed above, 2 days were spent in consideration of the antialien bill, yet monetary bills restoring the function of "coining money and regulating the value thereof" back to Congress, where it constitutionally belongs, cannot even be brought out of the committee room.

In conclusion may I say that, until real farm legislation restoring the purchasing power of that large group is enacted, until all our unemployed who can work are given permanent positions at decent living wages, thereby restoring purchasing power of that second large group, until the money problem is so solved as to get into free and constant circulation at the bottom of the economic pyramid through adequate old-age pensions, as well as the other two methods just mentioned—until this is done we can have no real recovery nor permanent prosperity. When this is done our country filled with employed and contented citizens will be a most sterile field for propagation of alien ideas and foreign "isms." This is our job as Congressmen, and I must say we have woefully failed in our duty.

MR. THORKELOSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

MR. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

MR. THORKELOSON. Does the gentleman know that approximately 200 Members of this House who are members of military organizations have already been fingerprinted?

MR. HILL. Members of what organizations?

MR. THORKELOSON. They are ex-service men or men who are now members of our Reserve forces. They have all been fingerprinted.

MR. HILL. I would suggest that that is a good thing. [Applause.]

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. CROWE, indefinitely, on account of official business as a delegate to the Interparliamentary Union.

To Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska, indefinitely, on account of official business as a delegate to the Interparliamentary Union.

To Mr. LUDLOW, on account of death in his family.

To Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana, for balance of session, on account of official business.

To Mr. HARRINGTON, for balance of session, on account of official business.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 281. An act to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930.

ADJOURNMENT

MR. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, August 2, 1939, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

MR. WARREN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 278. Resolution providing for the expenses of conducting the investigation authorized by House Resolution 277, of the Seventy-sixth Congress (Rept. No. 1425). Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. WARREN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 163. Resolution to authorize the payment of expenses of investigation authorized by House Resolution 162 (Rept. No. 1426). Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. WARREN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 265. Resolution providing for the expenses authorized in House Resolution 258 (Rept. No. 1427). Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1428. Report on the disposition of records in the Farm Credit Administration. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1429. Report on the disposition of records in the United States Civil Service Commission. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1430. Report on the disposition of records in the Works Progress Administration. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1431. Report on the disposition of records of the Panama Canal. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1432. Report on the disposition of records in the Federal Trade Commission. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1433. Report on the disposition of records in the Farm Credit Administration. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. DOXEY: Committee of conference. H. R. 4998. A bill to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921 (Rept. No. 1434). Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. CELLER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7235. A bill to prohibit the maintenance of gambling establishments within the admiralty and maritime jurisdiction of the United States, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1435). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. FLANNERY: Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. H. R. 5757. A bill to require that periodicals sent through the mails or introduced into interstate commerce contain the name of the publisher, the place of publication, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1436). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BURCH: Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. H. R. 2748. A bill to authorize the Postmaster General to contract for certain powerboat service in Alaska, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1437). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee of conference. S. 1164. An act for the relief of Nadine Sanders (Rept. No. 1438). Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FADDIS:

H. R. 7439. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to furnish certain markers for certain graves; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. R. 7440. A bill making it a criminal offense to, by force or show of force, delay, hinder, or prevent the production of goods destined for shipment in interstate or foreign commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MICHAEL J. KENNEDY:

H. R. 7441. A bill to provide for the application of the 2-cent rate on first-class matter for delivery within the confines of any incorporated city; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. STARNES of Alabama:

H. R. 7442. A bill to amend the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1939; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. WHELCHER:

H. R. 7443. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. CONNERY:

H. R. 7444. A bill to amend the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1939; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. EDMISTON:

H. R. 7445. A bill to amend the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1939; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. FLANNERY:

H. R. 7446. A bill to amend the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1939; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GEYER of California:

H. R. 7447. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to make a survey of the proposed "T" tunnel as a means of communication and transportation between San Pedro, Wilmington, Terminal Island, and Long Beach, Calif.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOUSTON:

H. R. 7448. A bill to amend the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1939; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. JOHNS:

H. R. 7449. A bill to liberalize effective date of claim for reimbursement for burial and funeral expenses contained in Veterans' Regulations; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. FAY:

H. R. 7450. A bill to amend the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1939; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. KIRWAN:

H. R. 7451. A bill to amend the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1939; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. SHANLEY:

H. R. 7452. A bill to amend the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1939; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington:

H. R. 7453. A bill to amend the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1939; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. WOOD:

H. R. 7454. A bill to eliminate certain oppressive labor practices affecting interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. HULL:

H. R. 7455. A bill to remove the depressing economic effects of excessive farm-mortgage debts, and prevent the further increase of farm tenancy due to mortgage foreclosures; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MICHAEL J. KENNEDY:

H. R. 7456. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to amend and consolidate the acts respecting copyright," approved March 4, 1909, as amended; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

H. J. Res. 377. Joint resolution authorizing the transfer of jurisdiction to certain lands in Missouri and Iowa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. Res. 287. Resolution to investigate John L. Lewis, the United Mine Workers, and the Congress of Industrial Organizations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. Res. 288. Resolution authorizing the House Committee on Foreign Affairs to have printed additional copies of the hearings on the proposed amendments to the present neutrality law and related legislation affecting the foreign policy of the United States; to the Committee on Printing.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOLTON:

H. R. 7457. A bill granting a pension to Isabelle Herbeson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 7458. A bill for the relief of Amelia Maria Cavarzan; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. KRAMER:

H. R. 7459. A bill for the relief of Bettina Bernstein; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. PATRICK:

H. R. 7460. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of R. Brinskelle and Charlie Melcher; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 7461. A bill for the relief of Diemer L. Bathrust; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5171. By Mr. COFFEE of Washington: Resolution of the Washington State Grange, passed at annual session at Vancouver, Wash., Harry Cheek, secretary, asserting that it will be necessary for the public-utility districts, formed for the purpose of distributing electrical power and to whom the Federal Government has loaned money for the purpose of constructing Rural Electrification Administration lines and engaging in the electric business, to purchase private utilities in order to facilitate an economic distribution of such electricity; therefore favoring Federal loans to public-utility districts for the purchase and acquisition of privately owned facilities; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

5172. Also, resolution of the Washington State Grange, passed at annual session at Vancouver, Wash., Harry Cheek, secretary, pointing out that the act of Congress which established Bonneville Dam power development provided that 50 percent of such power should be reserved for rural communities until January 1, 1941, and stating that certain power organizations who have refused to serve the rural people except at exorbitant price rates and construction costs are now seeking to gain control of the entire Bonneville output, and that such control would be extremely detrimental; therefore urging that Congress and Frank A. Banks, acting administrator of Bonneville Dam, reserve the 50 percent of power for rural communities at least until January 1, 1943; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

5173. Also, resolution of the Washington State Grange, passed at annual session at Vancouver, Wash., Harry Cheek, secretary, asserting that there is a bill before the Congress (S. 1675—H. R. 173) amortizing loans over a period of not less than 20 years; pointing out that a large percent of the land-bank commission loans set up on a 10-year repayment basis are becoming delinquent due to the low returns of farm crops; therefore urging that members of the Washington congressional delegation in the House and Senate work for Senate bill 1675 and House bill 173 to the end that relief should be extended on such heavy repayment charges; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5174. Also, resolution of the Washington State Grange, passed at annual session at Vancouver, Wash., Harry Cheek, secretary, pointing out that State officials are without adequate power to act against the private power companies who set up "phoney" organizations within States to cover part of their expenditures during campaigns against public ownership, as the organization directing such campaigns and the records necessary for action by State officials may be outside the State affected; therefore urging that Congress enact a law giving the Federal Power Commission authority to interfere when a great sum of money, in excess of a reasonable amount, is being spent in campaigns against public ownership, and where threats and intimidation are used to influ-

ence voters; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5175. Also, resolution of the Washington State Grange, passed at annual session at Vancouver, Wash., Harry Cheek, secretary, urging the enactment of a law by Congress that would compel a majority vote of all eligible voters of the United States before the United States could enter into an armed conflict on foreign soil; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5176. By Mr. KEOGH: Petition of the United Federal Workers of America, Regional Council, New York City, concerning House bills 7157 and 7160; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5177. Also, petition of the engineers and workers on Works Progress Administration projects, sponsored by borough president, Manhattan, New York City, concerning the lending bill, amending the 19-months clause in the relief bill; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5178. Also, petition of the Social Service Employees Union, New York City, concerning certain proposed amendments to the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5179. Also, petition of the Amalgamated Utility Workers, New York City, concerning proposed amendments to the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5180. By Mr. PFEIFER: Petition of George Meany, president, New York State Federation of Labor, New York City, urging support of the housing bill (S. 591); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5181. Also, petition of the Social Service Employees' Union, New York City, opposing certain proposed amendments to the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5182. Also, petition of the Amalgamated Utility Workers, New York City, concerning certain proposed amendments to the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5183. Also, petition of the China Aid Council, Los Angeles, Calif., concerning Japanese embargo on war supplies; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5184. Also, petition of engineers and workers of Work Projects Administration projects, sponsored by borough president, Manhattan, New York City, concerning the lending bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5185. By Mr. WOOD: Petition of F. M. Rice and 925 others, with reference to the construction of Osceola Dam on the Osage River in Missouri; to the Committee on Flood Control.

5186. Also, petition of W. T. Williams and others, with reference to proposed legislation affecting lay-offs and pay changes of Works Progress Administration employees; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5187. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Arizona Wool Growers Association, Phoenix, Ariz., petitioning consideration of their resolutions Nos. 3 and 14, with reference to reorganization of governmental departments and reciprocal-trade agreements; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

5188. Also, petition of the Advertising Club of Baltimore, Baltimore, Md., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the U. S. frigate *Constellation*; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 2, 1939

The Reverend Duncan Fraser, assistant rector, Church of the Epiphany, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O God, our Father, who hast ever kept us in Thy steadfast care and love: Grant, we beseech Thee, Thy blessing on this Nation, and upon all in authority therein, especially the President of the United States and the Members of this Congress; that they may speedily conclude their labors, and,